



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Maitland

1834 550



600007477V

34.

550.

A LETTER

TO THE

REV. HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D.

CHAPLAIN TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY;

WITH

STRICTURES

ON

MILNER'S CHURCH HISTORY.

BY S. R. MAITLAND.



LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, Pall Mall.

T. JEW, GLOUCESTER;
STRONG, BRISTOL AND EXETER; AND MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1834.

550.

GLOUCESTER:
JEW AND BRYANT, PRINTERS,
WESTGATE STREET.

A LETTER,

&c.

MY DEAR SIR,

When I saw your public notice of some remarks on Milner's Church History, which I published more than two years ago, it appeared to me that it would be right to render them more accessible than they have hitherto been, while forming a part of a large volume, on a subject respecting which but few persons take the trouble to enquire. I therefore reprint them, with no alteration, and very little addition; and, fortified by the concurrence which you have expressed, I shall not hesitate to ask whether they do not shew that Milner's History contains, in itself, sufficient grounds for considering it as of little or no value. I do not however mean to stake the question on what is discussed in these strictures, which were written only incidentally, in the prosecution of a particular design. I purpose, if it please God, to shew by a further examination of the book, and by reference to other parts of it, that it is extremely incorrect and defective; and that we may, without being

openly and avowedly, or secretly and basely, enemies of the Gospel, or of Milner, or of Calvinism, or of the Evangelical, or any other, party, form a very low estimate of its value.

But what do we mean by "value"? I am fully aware that there is a species of utilitarian expediency which will stoutly maintain the "value" of nonsense, error, and even falsehood, if it can be shewn that through the over-ruling providence of God, it has been productive of good. I am not afraid that you will misunderstand me; but as this letter is not intended merely for your private perusal, I feel it needful explicitly to disavow any intention of maintaining that Milner's History has never done any good to anybody. On the contrary, I believe that it has interested, edified, and instructed, many real christians; and I do most truly and conscientiously believe the same of the Golden Legend, though all Protestants, and most Papists, are agreed that it contains much that is false, and foolish, and wicked. What then do we really mean by "value"? If the admirers of Milner are prepared to say that his work (whether written with that view or not) does inculcate certain doctrines which they believe, and which I believe, to be true; and that, provided those *doctrines* are incul-

cated, it is of no consequence whether the *facts* are true or false—whether the writer went to “original records,” or “modern historians”—whether the citations are correct, or incorrect—whether the authorities referred to were understood by the author, and rendered intelligible to the reader, or not—whether it was A. or B. who was martyred, or made a bishop, at a certain time, and place, if only somebody was martyred, at some time, and somebody made a bishop somewhere, so as to give occasion for pious and edifying reflections—whether this or that writer really taught this, or that, or any, or no doctrine, provided only that the mention of his name gives an opportunity of stating and enforcing the doctrine which he should have held—if, I say, the admirers of Milner are prepared to maintain this, I shall not wonder to find that his History has great value in their eyes; though even then—looking upon it merely as a work which may be used to inculcate doctrine—I shall venture to say that it is most feeble, superficial, and defective. Should I seem to speak confidently, let me say that if it were a matter of skill, or taste, or scholarship, or if it were in any way whatever a matter of opinion, I hope I should not do so—but it is a mere matter of fact, respecting which

persons of very mean capacity are quite capable of judging, if they will but take the trouble to examine ; and if I could not speak confidently about it, I would not speak of it at all.

There is, however, no need to talk about this, for much more—and “value” of a very different kind—is claimed for Milner’s History by some of his admirers, in terms which, to those who have at all examined the work, must sound like bitter sarcasm, and which it is charitable to pass by without more specific notice. I should shrink from the man who would hesitate to say all that he could fairly say, in defence of a friend, or of a party (if he were so unhappy as to belong to one) and I hope that I should be willing to make every allowance for even the errors of friendship and zeal. But it is not every question that can be decided by a shew of hands ; and I cannot but think that Jerome’s rule is not only sound and good, but peculiarly applicable to the present case :—“*Nec bonis adversariorum (si honestum quid habuerint) detrahendum est, nec amicorum laudanda sunt vitia ; et unumquodque non personarum, sed rerum, pondere judicandum est.*”*

* Ad Pammachium de erroribus Origenis.

With regard to the Strictures themselves, while I am quite aware that they do not so fully prove the case as they might do if they were not principally directed to a single point, I also feel that they have on that ground a peculiar advantage. While all Protestants agree in regarding the History of the Waldenses as a most interesting and important part of the History of the Church of Christ, it is also a point on which, as far as I know, there has not been, and cannot be, any dispute between the orthodox and the evangelical, the High and the Low Church parties. The disputed points relating to the Albigenses and Waldenses, in which I am concerned, are of a different nature; and indeed now that the history of these Sects is brought into a controversy with which it has no particular connexion, I think I may fairly ask that my argument may not be judged of by these extracts, which I have culled from various parts of my book, merely on account of their reference to Milner, and in which, after your public reference to them, I have not felt myself at liberty to alter a syllable. Some notes, distinguished from those in the original work by [brackets], and a few remarks on some other errors connected with the same subject, I have added.

Thus much I have thought it necessary to premise concerning these Strictures ; not so much, I confess, for your information, as for that of some other persons to whose hands this letter may come. They will perhaps be surprised not to find what some of your friends, and all your enemies, would have taken occasion to introduce. This, however, has not been merely because I am conscious of unskilfulness in such matters ; but because, although they have been brought into this discussion, I do not see that your talents, acquirements, or personal circumstances, have anything to do with the matter ; and should I, at any time, consider it my duty to write to you about them, I feel that I should do it with more ease—and perhaps with more propriety—in a private letter ; believe me nevertheless to be, with sincere esteem and respect,

My Dear Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

S. R. MAITLAND.

[*Extract No. I. from "Facts and Documents illustrative of the History, Doctrine, and Rites of the ancient Albigenses and Waldenses."* p. 43.]

SECTION II.

REMARKS ON MILNER'S CHURCH HISTORY.

THE sources of information respecting ecclesiastical history, which some, even of the clergy, think it necessary to provide, are so limited, that many readers may possibly have no other book of reference on the subject, than Milner's History of the Church of Christ.* As, however, that writer has given what appears to me a totally erroneous view of the PAULICIANS, in which he is, as far as I know, unsupported by any other historian; and as he has ventured to tell us that with regard to the Waldenses, (under which name he comprehends the Cathari and Albigenses,) Mosheim's information is "SCANTY, CONFUSED, and ERRONEOUS;"† it seems necessary to enquire, what the authority of Milner really is; and what right he has to talk of the "mental imbecility,"‡ or the "temerity and self-sufficiency" of Mosheim.§

I can truly say, that I have no desire or disposition to undervalue Milner. His devoted piety, and general talents, are unquestioned. The classical learning, which

* The Author of the Christian Student has given a list entitled "The Curate's Library." Under the head of "Ecclesiastical History," we find only "Milner and Scott's History of the Church of Christ—Burnet's History of the Reformation—Whiston's Josephus." p. 415.

† Vol. III. p. 444. ‡ Vol. II. p. 478. § Vol. III. p. 371.

gave honour to his youth, was not likely to be lost, or diminished, during a life of tuition; and the "immense reading," and very extraordinary memory, which his biographer ascribes to him had, I doubt not, furnished him with a great fund of knowledge. It is, however, most evident that his knowledge was not of that description which would have qualified him for the task which he undertook; and without which, neither piety nor talents could render him respectable as a writer of church history—especially of such a history as he projected. I grant also, most willingly and fervently, that the design was noble; and feel as strongly as he did, that such a work as he proposed to write, was much to be desired; and that he who would gather up those materials which are not wanting, though never hitherto fully collected, would be doing a real service to the christian church.

I have just said that if any papist should tell me that our religion was not to be found before the time of Calvin and Luther, I should be satisfied to answer him according to his folly; but I would by no means be understood to admit the truth of his statement, for I believe it to be as false as it is foolish; and feel no doubt, that, in the darkest age, there were many true, and accepted, worshippers of God. Not formed into churches, and eminently bearing their testimony in corporate capacities *as* churches, against the See of Rome (for then I think we should have heard more about them *); but as the sheep of Christ dispersed abroad

[* The Reader will please to bear in mind, that I was led into this examination of the history of the Albigenses and Waldenses by the extravagant statement of Mr. Faber, that the apocalyptic prediction of the Witnesses had reference to two churches, "which should *eminently*, and in their corporate capacity *as* churches, bear their testimony, though in a depressed and persecuted condition, throughout the *entire period* of the latter 1260 years." This period he begins at A. D. 604; and asserts that the Albigenses and Waldenses have from that time fulfilled the prediction by testifying against "the demonolatrous apostacy," and will continue doing so "*unremittingly* during the *whole period* of the latter 1260 years." Sac. Cal. Vol. III. p. 22. 23.]

in the midst of this naughty world—known, perhaps, by this or that name of reproach—or, perhaps, the obscure and unknown, whose names were never written anywhere but in heaven. I doubt not that there were such, living a life of prayer and communion with God; overlooked in the bustle of cities, and the solitude of cottages, and even shut up in what modern systems require us to consider as the strong holds of Antichrist, the cell, and the cloister. I will not shrink from avowing my belief, that many a tonsured head now rests in Abraham's bosom; and that many a frail body, bowed down with voluntary humility, and wasted with unprofitable will-worship—clothed in rags, and girt with a bell-rope, was a temple of the Holy Ghost; and that one day—a day when the follies of system, and the sins of party, and man's judgment of his fellows, will have come to an end—these, her unknown children, will be revealed to the astonishment of a church, accustomed to look back, with a mixture of pride and shame, to the days of her barrenness. She may ask, "Who hath brought up these? Behold, I was left alone; these, where had they been?"—but she will have learned to know the seal of the living God, she will embrace them as her sons, and will find better matter of discourse, than their superstition and her illumination.

In the mean time, however, they are hidden—perhaps more completely hidden than they need be, if due pains were taken to look after them, and gather what might be known.

This is what Milner undertook; and the design was as noble, as the execution was feeble and defective. Every reflecting christian must, I think, concede to him that such a work was wanted in the church; though, perhaps, few may be prepared to go with him in all that he says respecting ecclesiastical history, even as it had been already written. "A history," he observes, "of the perversions and abuses of religion is not properly a history of the church; as absurd were it to suppose an history of the highwaymen that have infested this country to be a His-

“tory of England.” Why, happily for this country, the highwaymen have never been the most numerous, and influential, class of society ; but if they had been, pretty commonly, the dominant power in the state, and had so carried matters, that, during a course of ages, common honesty was high-treason, and day-labour a capital offence—if the rogues had been so many and so powerful, that a suspected disaffection to plunder was enough to hang a man ; it seems to me that a History of England which did not notice, and indeed was not considerably occupied with, the proceedings of the highwaymen, would be a very defective performance. Supposing ecclesiastical history, as it has generally been written, to be absolutely nothing more than secular history, yet, surely, of all secular history, it is to a christian, the most interesting, and instructive ; and “the perversions and abuses of religion” are matters which we are at least as much concerned to know, as the exploits of Alexander or Cæsar. Yet I grant that what Milner denominates “real church history,”—what may be called the history of God’s grace—being the history of God as well as man, and looking backwards and forwards through eternity, is the noblest of all histories ; and that to trace out, and commemorate, the manifestations of God’s light in a world of darkness, is a work of higher style and interest, than any other in which the historian can be engaged.

He, however, who undertakes it, will find that it is a work of no common labour. If he is satisfied to go to Alban Butler’s Lives of the Saints, and to copy from the Centuriators, and Dupin—to dilate upon Augustine, and Gregory, and Bernard, or wherever else the learned care of ages has prepared matters to his hand—and to dwell upon those scenes which have been detailed in history, and sifted in controversy—if he is satisfied, and expects his readers to be satisfied, with this, he may soon make a book ; and if he has the piety and talent of Milner, a popular and useful book. But surely “the real church” historian, supposing him to have all, and more than all, the qualifi-

cations of Milner, must go to work in another fashion, if he would do any thing like even such imperfect justice, as uninspired man can do, to such a subject. If his object is to trace the true light shining in darkness, he is not to wait till persecution has fanned up a flame, and then to run just where he sees a blaze, to warm himself at the stake, and rake in the ashes for relics—much less is he to trust to picking up those relics at second hand from pedlars, and to give his account of the Auto-da-fé from the newspaper. He must be out at nights, creeping under the hedge and beside the ditch, in darkness and dirt, to catch the glow-worm—or, to speak plainly, he must toil through much that is useless, worthless, and repulsive—much offence to taste, logic, and common sense; much ignorance, and much superstition—he must be strong in mind, in body, and in purpose—his daily task must be “the reading that was never read;” and half his books what where not thought worth printing—he must tuck up his sleeves, and bid defiance to dirt, and dog-latin, and all the tricks of monkish penmanship—he must have free access to old and large libraries, and full permission to ransack their stores—and he must *not* (however useful and honourable those employments may be, *he* must not) write basket-fuls of sermons, and spend six hours a day in teaching greek and latin.*

* “During the first twenty-three years of his life, we find him “exerting every nerve to acquire knowledge; and during a great part “of the last thirty years, he is *daily five or six hours in his school*; then “besides his *frequent preachings and visitations of the sick*, his *poetical compositions*, and *many baskets full of Sermons* committed to the flames, “on account of the Author’s disapprobation of their contents, there “are now in existence *eight or nine hundred Sermons* in manuscript, “composed after the Author’s sentiments had changed and were fixed.” *Dean Milner’s life of Milner prefixed to his Sermons.* p. lix. If these are, as the Dean states, and as I most fully believe, “undoubted facts”—and if there is another fact which I think no reader of Milner’s History can doubt; namely, that he had very limited access to such books as his undertaking required him to consult—if, as the Dean also

Suppose a man should tell us that wood and hay, corn and cattle, and all that is maintained on earth's surface, is mean and perishable; and that true riches consist in gold and silver, the diamond and the pearl—we may, perhaps, be inclined to think that bread, and beef, and broad cloth, and all the staple of the farmer, and the manufacturer, are not bad things for common purposes, but acknowledging his nobler taste in accumulation, we keep our low conceits to ourselves, and visit his collection with respect and curiosity. It is very scanty; and he feels that it is so, while he exhibits this, and the other, morsel, and candidly states his uncertainty whether this piece of ore is really gold, and that rough stone really a diamond; and he tells us often, and with much feeling, that gold is scarce, and gems are not easily come by. We feel disappointed; but knowing the truth of his apology, and not questioning his diligence, we join in his lamentation, and make the most of the little before us.

Suppose, however, it should appear that this collector never went farther than the high-road, the ploughed field, and the market place, to gather his stores? We know, to be sure, that travellers may drop coins, and trinkets, on the highway—that road-makers may hit upon a vein in cutting down a hill, and road-menders may accidentally bring scraps of ore among their materials—that the plough may turn up minerals, and that those who have dredged for nothing but oysters, have often fished up pearls—but, even knowing all this, should we wonder that his collection was scanty, while he was content to be a pensioner on the accidental help of persons engaged in pursuits quite different from his own—many of whom did not know the things which he was seeking, when they saw them—never

states, "the Scriptures were his constant study, and *profane* history his amusement," how could he think of undertaking an *ecclesiastical* history, especially on a plan which rendered the works of all his predecessors, if not entirely useless, at least very insufficient and *unsafe* guides?

thought of looking for them—and even if they came in their way, threw them aside, as things not to their purpose? He might, to be sure, tell us that it would be very tiresome and laborious to be digging in mines, and diving in the ocean; and that he had neither the means, nor the leisure, for such undertakings. This might be true beyond dispute; and what must we answer? May we compliment him by saying, as Milner does, “IN MAGNIS VOLUISSE SAT EST?” I really feel that I could not; for it does not appear to me that every attempt at great things is praiseworthy; and however magnificent the projected tower may be—whatever plans and elevations the architect may shew—surely we cannot commend him if he begins to build without a due estimate of his means; and trusts that the excellency of his design, will atone for whatever he may do or leave undone.

This seems to me the more important, because I cannot help thinking, that Milner's work is liable to encrease, rather than to diminish, the evil which he proposed to remedy. Referring to the way in which ecclesiastical history has generally been written, he says, “the evils which “have been practised in christian countries, seem even “greater than they really were; and the disagreeable “inference which the reading of Mosheim produced in my “own mind, is probably no singular case, viz.—that real “religion appears scarcely to have had any existence. “Infidel malice has triumphed though very unreasonably “on account of these things,”* &c. I must say that, to my own mind, the evil which Milner states, does not appear so important as he seems to have considered it; and I am inclined to think, that those who have written on religious subjects, with a professed view of removing, or under a pressing fear of creating, offence in infidels, have too often exposed themselves, and, as far as they could, their cause. Yet, I grant that it is an evil, and one that ought to be met; but how? In fact how did the case

* Introd. p. 5.

stand before, and how does it stand at present? When Milner heard the infidel unjustly triumphing, he might have told him that the ecclesiastical historians of whom he spoke, were the annalists of a secularized church, and made no profession of seeking out, and drawing to light, those whose characteristic it is, that the world knoweth them not; but were we now to tell him this, he would answer, "well, "I grant this, but here is a writer of *real* church history—one whose mind was affected as my own is—and who went "to work on that very account, and with a special view to "meet this objection—and what is the result?"

Let me however, be more specific—for I should be sorry to be thought guilty of falsely accusing, or even underrating any man, especially one, on many accounts, so respectable.

If there ever was a period, with reference to which the infidel's objection might seem to be plausible, and when he might pretend that real religion was not to be found, and the real church not in existence, surely it was in the tenth century, commonly called the *SÆCULUM OBSCURUM*. For such a period, the writer of "real church history," whose express object it was to meet this objection, would surely exert himself; and would think nothing of picking over a bushel of chaff, if peradventure he might find two grains of wheat. Though he might learn from Baronius, that it was "a dark age, remarkable above all "others for the scarcity of writers and men of learning,"* he would be anxious to get hold of whatever writers there were; and though he might take the Cardinal's word that they were not men of learning, would not feel satisfied without examination, that some of them might not be such persons as he was in search of. Dupin† would fur-

* Milner, Vol. III. 245.

† "From whom," says Milner, (though Dupin was a Roman Catholic, and one of the authors whose deficiencies he was writing to supply) "I derive particular information on subjects of this nature." Vol. II. p. 529.

nish a list of eighty-six writers of this century—some of them, to be sure, little more than names, some hard to get at, and some, perhaps, quite out of reach—but does it appear that Milner ever saw *one*? that he ever looked into a *single writer* of the tenth century, to see whether there might not be something to his purpose, which the defective historians had passed over? I think not—he does not speak as if he had ever seen, or sought after, or thought of looking at, one; though the extracts which he found in the Centuriators, might have tempted him.* Mosheim alone, would have furnished him with references to a host of historians, and other writers relative to the period—did he refer to them? Let the reader compare the references of the two historians, and judge. In fact, Milner has disposed of the whole century—one, not only requiring, as I have said, his utmost exertion from its obscurity, but one that offered to the apologist of christian missions, a fair prospect of reward for his labours—in *thirty-eight* octavo pages, of which *five* are an apology for christian missions; and his references shew the sources from whence he derived what information he had. They are *thirty-two* in number

* As they did on another occasion, “All the accounts of antiquity “are full of the praises of Vicelinus; and his character is briefly, “but very strongly celebrated by Mosheim, with such unqualified “commendations, that I cannot but wish that very learned historian “had favoured us with an abridgment of his life and actions, taken “from the sources of information, which *he quotes* but *which seem to* “*us* inaccessible. I have consulted the Centuriators, and find matter “there *sufficient to excite, but not to satisfy* our curiosity. The *little to* “*be collected from them* shall be mentioned in the next chapter. And “here is an instance of that which I have had but *too frequent* occasion to remark, namely, an *extreme scantiness* of information on “subjects most worthy of our researches [researches?] How willingly “would the evangelical reader have excused the omission of many pages “in Mosheim, if he had gratified us with an orderly account of one of the “best and wisest christian missionaries of the age.” Vol. III. p. 431. If he had written without prejudice, could Milner have helped seeing, that such a detailed account of an individual, however excellent, was not Mosheim’s business, and that it was most particularly his own?

—*nineteen* to the CENTURIATORS, who “omit, or very lamely recount, some most important Christian facts,”*—*five* to ALBAN BUTLER, “a zealous Roman Catholic”†—*four* to MOSHEIM, whose deficiencies it was his object to supply—*one* to BARONIUS, almost, I apprehend, as zealous a Roman Catholic as Alban Butler, and as defective a historian as Mosheim—*one* to BISHOP NEWTON—*one* to GIBBON—and (we must go if possible a step farther from orthodoxy) *one* to the KING OF PRUSSIA.

Now people who ever smile, must surely be tempted when they see such a motley group assembled, to lend their aid to a writer of “real church history,” and to enable him to supply the defects of former historians, respecting the state of true religion, in an obscure, but very interesting, period of history! Yet I feel that it is no laughing matter, when we couple it with Milner’s pretensions—with his constant reproach of others—and, above all, with his own plain and positive statement, “I have all along, however, to the best of my ability, and opportunity, consulted ORIGINAL RECORDS, and have NEVER contented myself with copying the sentiments of MODERN HISTORIANS.” What original records of the tenth century—I do not mean autograph manuscripts—but what writer of the tenth century, or that was not *modern* by *five hundred years* did he consult? I suppose that all we can say is, that this declaration (though prefixed to subsequent editions of the whole work) was made when he had written only the first volume, and that by *original records*, he meant the New Testament, and the works of the most commonly known fathers of the first three centuries; and that when he got farther, and *original records* became more difficult to obtain, he changed his plan. This may have been the case; but it is a pity that if his ability, and opportunity, for consulting original records, did not extend farther than his references seem to indicate, he did not desist when such references became not only more difficult, but more neces-

* Introd. p. v.

† Vol. III, 195.

sary. But of the possibility of getting almost any, but the commonest books, he seems to have had scarcely any idea, and it is hard to imagine with what stock of church-history-reading, and books, he set out upon his arduous undertaking. The Centuriators, to whom more than half the above references are made, he "did not meet with" until he had finished his first volume.* and if he had ever seen the Councils, he managed, I believe, to get into the ninth century, and to the 209th page of his third volume, without a single reference to them.

This, however, is the writer who, in regard to the Waldenses, tells us that "the information of Mosheim concerning this people, seems very *scanty, confused, and* "and *erroneous.*"† The Chancellor of Göttingen, pleading the privilege of age,‡ was inclined to boast, that after the greatest part of a life devoted to the study of ecclesiastical history; and a course of reading which, even when we give him credit for unusual diligence, and extraordinary means, seems almost incredible;§ he was able to throw

* I do not mean that they were necessary to that part of his undertaking, where, in fact, they would have been of less use than in any other—but what he says (Introd. p. 5,) seems to imply that he did not know the book, until after he had written the history of three centuries.

† Vol. III. p. 444.

‡ "Licet mihi jure senectutis uti, et pauca quædam de me gloriari." *Præf.*

§ It must be observed, that the innumerable references of Mosheim, (at least according to his statement, which I have never found reason to doubt) were not collected at second hand; but that in *every case*, he had the books before him, and read, and compared, for himself—"omnes quos testatus sum, ipse ante oculos habui, tractavi, legi, inter "se contuli, alienæque fidei me committere nolui." Poor man—he little thought that his numerous references would be turned into a ground of accusation. "The learned Dr. Mosheim," says the editor of the fifth volume of Milner's History, "in his compendium, refers to "a long list of eminent authors, who, he says, are to be consulted in "confirmation of his brief statements. Now such an intimation "appears to me, to have the effect of at once overwhelming the

fresh light on some few subjects, which he specified in his preface. Among these were the Cathari, and Albigenses, as he denominates persons of whom Milner speaks under the name of Waldenses. Respecting these persons we might, therefore, especially doubt whether Mosheim's information was "scanty," even if it should turn out to be (unlike his information on other subjects) "confused and erroneous." For brevity's sake, however, as well as to cut off all possibility of cavil, let us take the word Waldenses, not as it is generally used by Milner, but in the restricted sense in which Mosheim (following, I believe, every ancient writer who had any knowledge of the sect) employed it. Did any body ever suppose for a moment, that Milner had ever seen the outside of one half the works which Mosheim quotes at one opening of his book?"* I must say—and I say it sincerely—that I have such confidence in Milner's good sense, and sound judgment, as renders me almost certain that, if he had done so, his own account of the Waldenses would have been, I do not say less scanty, (for it is just one of the faults of his history, that he dilates where information is the most plentiful and easily obtained) but certainly less "*confused and erroneous*," than it undoubtedly is.

"courage and resolution of any *ordinary student* of ecclesiastical history." I really do not see this, unless the ordinary student is compelled by force, or law, to look out the references, and made an extraordinary student against his will; supposing it to be true, as to ordinary *students*, what should the effect have been on one who professed to be something more than an ordinary *writer* of Church History?

* pp. 486, 487. They are, DU CANGE *Gloss.*—NICOL. EYMERICI *Direct. Inquis.*—STEPH. de BORBONE *de Sept. Donis Sp. S. in JAC. ECHARD et QUETIF Bib. Scrip. Dominic.*—ANON. *de hæresi Paup. de Lug. in MARTENE Thesaur. Anecd.*—REINERIIUS SACHO—MONETA *Sum. cont. Cath. et Vald. a RICHINIO ed.*—PILICHDORFIUS *con. Vald.*—JO. PAUL. PERRIN *Hist. &c.*—JO. LEGER *Hist. gen. des Eg. Vaud.*—JAC. USSERII *de Successione Ecc.*—JAC. BASNAGE *Hist. des Egl. Ref.*—T. A. RICHINIUS *Diss. de Wald.*—BOULAY *Hist. Acad. Paris*,—and on the next page, he adds what is certainly one of the most important authorities, "*Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanæ a LIMBORCHIO editus.*"

SECTION III.

THE PAULICIANS.

IN order to form a right opinion of the Albigenses, and their claim to be considered as persons of eminent piety, and real reformers of the church, it seems needful to take some notice of the faith, and history, of the Paulicians, a sect who arose in the East, in the seventh century; and I am the more inclined to do this because, as I have elsewhere stated, an attempt has been made to maintain their orthodoxy, and to set them up as the witnesses.* The truth is, I believe, that those who maintain the doctrine of the 1260 years, have been so hard pressed in their attempts to find witnesses, that they have been glad to seize hold of any persons, who have been, or whom they can pretend to have been, in any way opposed to that power, whom their system compels them to consider as the Man of Sin. What has been already cited from Mr. Faber's work, sufficiently evinces how difficult it is to obtain anything in the shape of witnesses against the Papacy, in the West, before the twelfth century; and therefore some writers have endeavoured to shew, not only that the Paulicians were eminently orthodox, but also, that they were persecuted by the See of Rome.

On these two points, then, it would be worth while to say a few words, were it only to expose the erroneous statements by which that system, which it is my object to oppose, is maintained—but beside this, some notice of this sect will, I think, greatly conduce to our taking a proper view of the Albigenses.

As to the Paulicians, I do not know of any historian, before Milner, who has not considered them as heretics; and why he thus departed from the course of his prede-

* Letter to the Rev. W. Digby, p. 59.

cessors, unless he was led by mistake, or prejudice, does not appear. He does not pretend to have any authority. He tells us that he drew his materials from Gibbon, and Mosheim. The original writers not having fallen into his hands, he says, "by the assistance of the two modern authors, I shall state the few facts which are known, and give as impartial a judgment, concerning the sect in question, as I can." How far he really has followed these authors, as to the facts of the case, remains to be seen ; but I must first notice what he adds in this place, and what, perhaps, suggested to him a course which is, I believe, in direct opposition to that of every other historian.

After thus mentioning the authors, by whose assistance he meant to state the facts respecting the Paulicians, he adds, "the candour of Gibbon is remarkable in this part of his history. O si sic omnia !"

Gibbon's candour on such a subject *remarkable* ? Why, had Milner ever known an infidel, who was not affectionately candid towards heretics, who had been persecuted by the orthodox ? Surely the "victims of spiritual tyranny," were just the objects to excite the candour of Gibbon, and this Milner, of all men, ought to have known.* Gibbon had been obliged, in his XVI Chapter, to exhibit the mild virtues of paganism, as sullied by something

* "The very little leisure, which the laborious employment of teaching a school, and other still more important cares, have left me, I studiously devote to the reading of history. Mr. Gibbon's performance falling in my way, I read it with avidity, delighted as I went along, to find a new light and order given to subjects, which I had read indeed when young, but had never seen arranged with such perspicuity and philosophical precision. In one point of view only, truth and impartiality, seemed evidently to be wanting. The reader will be beforehand with me in supposing I mean, *whatever has any relation to Christianity*. The following sheets, perhaps, may convince him, that it would not be wrong to add, *any relation to Christianity, direct or indirect*. The sagacious author, scents the despised religion at an immense distance, and steadily pursues his game, through the most intricate thickets, with unwearied assiduity." Milner's Gibbon's account of Christianity considered. Pref. p. 4.

almost amounting to persecution; and to admit those sufferings, which "the primitive christians lamented, and *perhaps* magnified"—he had been obliged to suggest, that "these *transient* sufferings, served only to revive the zeal, and to restore the discipline, of the faithful"—to smooth down the persecution of Marcus Antoninus, into "the *hardships* which they endured under the government of a *virtuous* prince.....who had despised the christians as a philosopher, and punished them as "a sovereign"—to point out in the "*mitigated* persecution" of Severus, "the *indulgent* spirit of Rome and Polytheism"—to shew that the proceedings of Maximin, have "*improperly* received the name of persecution"—and that "the effects of his resentment against the christians, were of a very local and temporary nature"—to palliate "the *rigorous treatment* which they experienced under the short reign of Decius," and to tell us that "the *virtues* of that prince, will scarcely allow us to suspect that he was actuated by a mean resentment against the favourites of his predecessor; and it is more reasonable to believe that, in the prosecution of his general design to restore the purity of Roman manners, he was desirous of delivering the empire from what he condemned as a recent, and criminal, superstition. The bishops of the most considerable cities were *removed* by exile or death"—and with regard to Diocletian's persecution, to soften down matters as much as might be, and give prominence to "the circumstances which insinuate that the general treatment of the christians, who had been apprehended by the officers of justice, was less intolerable than it is usually imagined to have been."

Gibbon had been compelled to notice the persecution of the christians by pagans, in his XVI Chapter, and, in his LIV, he found and took his revenge. Here was an event in the history of "the prostrate Greeks, who were content to fast, and pray, and believe, in blind obedience to the patriarch and his clergy"—things requiring no "energy, or exercise of the mental faculties"—which gave him an

opportunity of talking of "the two religions of Zoroaster and Christ," and setting forth the "equal and unrelenting hatred," with which they both persecuted the innocent Manichæans. No doubt he was "candid" towards those who rejected the Epistles of St. Peter, when it gave him an opportunity of stating, that they were "justified by some of the most respectable of the ancients, and moderns;" and of hinting at "a sham quarrel, a pious fraud," between the Apostles. He was candid to those who "overlooked" the Apocalypse, because it enabled him to suggest that, as this was not charged upon them as heresy, the Greek church probably did the same. In short, let any man read this fifty-fourth chapter of Gibbon, and I think he must see that all this talk about the Paulicians, was only intended to introduce an invective against christianity; and that the artful infidel dilated through twenty quarto pages, on a subject which might have been dispatched in one, merely because it gave him an opportunity for sneer, and sarcasm, against the religion which both the Paulicians, and their persecutors, professed. What had the historian of the ninth century—or even of the whole decline and fall—to do with "the character and consequences of the Reformation"—with Calvin and Servetus—and with the "modern clergy" who subscribe "the forms of orthodoxy, the articles of faith" with "a smile or a sigh?" "The candour of Gibbon is remarkable in this part of his history!" Yes, truly, so remarkable that I wonder Milner did not reject the Grecian gift.

The well read historian of the Decline and Fall, might afford to say, that the work of Photius had not *fallen into his hands*; but the echo from Milner, is very sad. "Photius and Peter have not fallen into my hands." No, indeed, it seems as if none of the books which a historian of that period ought to have consulted, had fallen into his hands, except Gibbon, and Mosheim; and he says, "by the assistance of the two modern authors, I shall state the few facts which are known, and give as impartial a judgment concerning the sect in question, as I can."

Well then, with all this remarkable candour, what is the account which Gibbon has given of the Paulicians? He tells us that "a branch of Manichæans were selected "as the victims of spiritual tyranny"—"their founders "rejected the two Epistles of St. Peter"—"they agreed "with their Gnostic brethren in the universal contempt "for the Old Testament, the books of Moses, and the "prophets, which have been consecrated by the decrees of "the Catholic Church"—"in the practice, or at least in "the theory, of the sacraments, the Paulicians were "inclined to abolish all visible objects of worship, and the "words of the gospel were, in their judgment, the baptism, and communion, of the faithful. They indulged "a convenient latitude for the interpretation of Scripture; "and, as often as they were pressed by the literal sense, "they could escape to the intricate mazes of figure and "allegory. Their utmost diligence must have been employed to dissolve the connexion between the Old and "the New Testament, since they adored the latter as the "oracles of God, and abhorred the former as the fabulous "and absurd invention of men or dæmons. We cannot be "surprised that they should have found in the Gospel the "orthodox mystery of the Trinity; but, instead of confessing the human nature and substantial sufferings of Christ, "they amused their fancy with a celestial body that passed "through the Virgin, like water through a pipe; with a "phantastic crucifixion, that eluded the vain and impotent "malice of the Jews. A creed thus *simple* and *spiritual*, "was not adapted to the genius of the times; and the "rational christian, who might have been contented with "the light yoke and easy burden of Jesus and his Apostles, "was justly offended that the Paulicians should dare to "violate the unity of God, the first article of natural and "revealed religion. Their belief and trust was in the "Father of Christ, of the human soul, and of the invisible "world. But they likewise held the eternity of matter; a "stubborn and rebellious substance, the origin of a second "principle, of an active being, who has created the visible

"world, and exercises his temporal reign till the final consummation of death and sin."

Such is the account of the Paulician creed which is given by the remarkably candid historian; and on what authority did Milner contradict it? Was it on the authority of his other professed guide? Certainly not. Mosheim tells us that the Paulicians were "a sect that may be considered as a branch of the Manichæans" (*secta Manichæi cognata*); and proceeds to give an account, so much like that already quoted, that it is not worth while to tire the reader with what would be little more than repetition. It may be enough to observe, that he says, "they were not altogether Manichees (*germani Manichæi*) though they embraced some opinions that resembled certain tenets of that abominable sect"—and he afterwards adds, in a note, "it is evident, beyond all contradiction, that the Paulicians, in imitation of the oriental philosophers from whom the Gnostics and Manichæans derived their origin, considered *eternal matter* as the seat and source of all evil; but they believed, at the same time, like many of the Gnostics, that this *matter*, endued from all eternity with life and motion, had produced an active principle, which was the fountain of vice, misery, and disorder. this principle, according to them, is the author of all material substances; while God is the Creator and Father of Spirits. These tenets resemble, no doubt, the Manichæan doctrine; yet, they differ from it in several points. It appears most probable, that the Paulicians were extremely numerous and diversified, and which, though persecuted and oppressed from age to age in the most rigorous manner, by many emperors, could never be entirely suppressed, nor totally extirpated."*

* Cent. ix. P. ii. ch. v. §. 6. I quote MacLaine's translation because Milner has said, at p. 373 of this Volume: "As Mosheim's work, translated by MacLaine, is better known than the original in England, I always quote the former, and would be understood, both here and elsewhere, to refer to that rather than to the latter." It is therefore

Milner's objections, for they cannot be called arguments, are really scarcely worth noticing; and it will be more to the purpose to discover, if we can, what induced him to dress up the Paulicians in eminent orthodoxy; and, in defiance of his two professed guides, (and, I believe, of every other ecclesiastical writer) to discover in them "one of those extraordinary effusions of the Divine Spirit, by which the knowledge of Christ, and the practice of godliness, is kept alive in the world."

How came he to differ so widely from all his predecessors, Greek, Papal, and Protestant—Infidel and Christian?

I do not wish to be uncharitable to him, or to those of his protestant predecessors to whom the remark may apply, but I cannot help thinking that a circumstance may be noticed, which will go far towards explaining the matter. It is this—he *did*, and they *did not*, suppose that the *Pope* was concerned in the persecution of the Paulicians. The discovery that *Rome* had anything to do with the business, was, I believe, reserved for Milner; for I find no hint of it in Mosheim, or Gibbon, or in any other writer whose works I have met with. The fact seems to be, that in writing his chapter on the Paulicians, Milner strayed away from his professed guides, and got hold of a letter of Pope Nicolas

only fair to him that I should do the same; but that it is not safe, this single note may shew. The translator has taken the liberty to put in, and put out, important matter. Mosheim does not say, that the Paulicians "were extremely numerous," or at all "diversified;" and he does say, that he was inclined to believe that they were the offspring of the Gnostics. His words (professedly translated above) are "*Affinia hæc sunt Manichæorum dogmati: sed ab eo etiam diversa. Credi-derim, hanc sectam sobolem esse unius ex antiquis Gnosticorum familiis: quæ, multis licet Imperatorum legibus et supplicibus misere vexatæ, numquam tamen opprimi et extirpari potuerunt.*" p. 352. It will be obvious to any body who takes the trouble to compare them, that some of Milner's unjust censures of Mosheim, arose from his using the translation instead of the original. It might be well to refer to the translation in common cases, but when he took upon him to censure Mosheim, he should surely have looked to see whether the translation was correct.

which he misunderstood. The Councils, apparently for the first time, fell into his hands, just when he was engaged with a subject on which they could give him no information, and they only led him astray. From this letter, which he found there, he gathered that the Paulicians were persecuted by the "antichristian tyranny" of Rome. This put the matter in quite a different light. The Paulicians were, in all probability, very excellent people—no doubt all insinuation of heresy was slander—they were reformers, martyrs, confessors, witnesses, *the witnesses*—and it seemed but justice to believe, that their only crime was, that they would not receive the mark of the beast.

This letter of Pope Nicolas was not unknown to the predecessors of Milner, but they understood it; and I do not say that, if they had misunderstood it as widely as he did, they would have gone as far as he has done in dressing up the Paulicians. Several of them, however, would have been under great temptation. Some of those who quietly set down the Paulicians as heretics (such as the Centurians, F. Spanheim, Venema, and Peter Allix) had as sharp a scent for witnesses as Matthew Hopkins had for a witch; and if they had not discovered in the Paulicians an "extraordinary effusion of the Divine Spirit," would at least have said what they could for them.

Let us, however, see how far there is any ground for connecting the Pope with the Paulicians. Milner says,

"Theodora was succeeded by her son Michael. Her cruelties
 "and superstitions deserved the applause of Nicolas, who
 "became Pope of Rome in 858. In a letter, he highly approved
 "her conduct, and admired her on account of her implicit
 "obedience to the Holy See. We learn from the biographer of
 "the Emperor Michael what Theodora had done to call forth
 "the encomiums of this pontiff. 'She resolved,' says he, 'to
 "bring the Paulicians to the true faith, or cut them all off root
 "and branch'—a resolution worthy of a truly catholic prin-
 "cess!—'pursuant to that resolution, she sent some noblemen
 "and magistrates,' not preachers or missionaries,—'into the
 "different provinces of the empire; and, by them, some of

“ those unhappy wretches were crucified, some put to the sword, and some thrown into the sea and drowned.’ Thus were they slaughtered to the number of one hundred thousand, and their goods and estates confiscated.*

“ The pope alluded to this bloody massacre, when he commends Theodora in the same letter for the manly vigour she exerted, the Lord co-operating (*Domino co-operante*) as he blasphemously adds, against obstinate and incorrigible heretics. Nicolas, at the same time observes, that the heretics, experiencing in her all the resolution and vigour of a man, could scarcely believe her to be a woman. Indeed zeal for religion had changed in Theodora, as it did in our queen Mary, the tender and compassionate heart of a woman into that of a merciless and blood-thirsty tyrant. And here I am not disposed to suppress, that from the pope’s own words, it appears, that *the Apostolic See had its share in the glorious exploit* just mentioned; for the pope, after telling her that the heretics dreaded, and at the same admired, her resolution and steadiness in maintaining the purity of the catholic faith, adds, “ *and why so, but because you followed the directions of the Apostolic See?*’.*

“ So truly was Antichristian tyranny now established at Rome.” Vol. III. p. 208.

Now suppose we grant the utmost that Milner could desire to prove—that the Paulicians were the special witnesses of God—that Theodora persecuted them—that she did this by direction of the Pope—and that, therefore, the pope was Antichrist. Suppose, I say, that for the sake of argument we admit this; will not these things, which prove the pope of Rome to be Antichrist, equally prove the patriarch of Constantinople to be Antichrist?

“ Oh dear, no,” says the reader of Milner, “ what had the patriarch to do with it? His name is never once mentioned in the business.” Very true—his name is not mentioned by Milner, but it is mentioned in “ the pope’s own words,” a half sentence of which Milner has unfairly

* Porphyrog.

* Concil. Lab. Nic. Ep. xiv.

translated. The pope's "own words" are "*Cur hoc nisi quia Sedis Apostolicæ dogmata sequebaris, et Constantinopolitani monita Pontificis, cui Romana Ecclesia communicabat, amplectebaris?*" I need hardly observe how unfair it is to translate "dogmata" by "directions"—but let the *dogmata* of the pope have been what they might, surely they were no worse than the *monita* of the patriarch.

To come, however, to the point. Does this letter of pope Nicolas, to the empress Theodora, relate to the Paulicians *at all*? I believe it does not.

"We learn," says Milner, "from the biographer of Michael, what Theodora had done to call forth the encomiums of the pontiff." Why, surely, Milner must have known, that Theodora had done something else, far more likely to call forth the encomiums of the pontiff, than her persecution of the Paulicians, of whom, as far as I know, no pope ever took any notice whatever. He must surely have known, that the great event of her life—that event for which she has been magnified, and extolled, by every papal historian—for which she was placed, and still stands, as a saint in the Greek calendar—was, that following the dogmata, (that is holding the doctrine) of the Apostolic See, which her husband had renounced, she had restored, and triumphantly established, the worship of images in the eastern church, after the long and fierce struggle, which had rent asunder Rome and Constantinople.

Theophilus (her husband) had been an active adversary of the image worshippers. On his death, their son Michael III. being a child, the reins of government were assumed by Theodora. She, whether from her own personal attachment to image-worship, or terrified by the threats of the most powerful persons of the court—or, as the pope's letter seems to suggest, following the monita of the patriarch—moved by some, or, perhaps, by all these motives, the fact is unquestionable, that on her coming into power, she set to work so energetically, to put down the Iconoclasts, that the pope might well say that those "heretics, experiencing in her all the resolution, and

"vigour of a man, could scarcely believe her to be a woman."*

The reader will observe, that the pope speaks of "communicating," or being in communion with, the patriarch, whose monitions the empress had followed; and he had, in fact, (whether we take the word in its ordinary, or in its ecclesiastical sense) "communicated" with Nicephorus, the exiled patriarch, whose *monita*, while he lived, were in strict accordance with the actions of Theodora after his death. He had also communicated with Methodius, whom it was one of the first acts of Theodora to raise to the patriarchal dignity, and who had, in fact, resided for some years at Rome, as the legate, or (whatever may be the exact meaning of the title, at this time, and under these circumstances) as the Apocrisiarius of Nicephorus. With *these* the Pope was in ecclesiastical communion, while others were *excommunicated* for opposing the doctrines, or "dogmata, of the Apostolic See," which they followed; and, with them, he was in what may be called political, or personal, communication, as to the means which should be used to restore image-worship in the east—on *this* subject the Romish See (which, as far as I can find, knew nothing about the Paulicians) was deeply interested, and warmly engaged—in *this* matter Rome gained a signal

* In fact her vigour in this business is described in these very terms, by Theophanes, who says, "in pietatis studium curamque maxime incubuit fœmina, vere Dei munere (ut nomen ejus indicat) data ex omnibus præclaris et magnis facinoribus, quibus principes probari solent, nullum præstantius existimans, quo tutius sibi imperium confirmaret, aut virilem in fœminea persona fortitudinem exerceret, quam si pietatis et religionis cultu Deum sibi propitium redderet. "Id autem nullo pacto facilius aut commodius posse contingere, quam si perturbationem in Ecclesia jam diu excitatam sedaret, &c." cited Baron. Ann. 842. §. 12. In pursuance of this conviction, she deposed the Inconoclast patriarch John, and put in his place, Methodius. The reader who wishes for more information as to this history, may find it in Gibbon, c. 54; and the authorities which he cites. But a minute and elaborate investigation of the points here referred to may be found in Walch's Historie der Kezereien. Vol. X. p. 728.

triumph, when Theodora, "following the dogmata of the Apostolic See," re-established the worship of images, and showed herself, as Baronius speaks, "*sanctarum imaginum fortissima propugnatrix, potentissima restitutrix, atque tenacissima conservatrix.*"*

After governing for thirteen years, the empress Theodora was deposed, and shut up in a convent by her brutal son, Michael III. The pope having occasion, eleven years afterwards, to send legates to Constantinople, wrote the letter in question to the empress; and it was one of seven with which his messengers were charged. All these letters relate to the deposition of the patriarch Ignatius, and I do not find, or believe that any unprejudiced reader could find, any allusion to the Paulicians. In fact, I do not know that anybody but Milner ever dreamed of such a thing, though these letters could scarcely be unknown to his predecessors, and professed guides, Gibbon and Mosheim; neither of whom would have been under any temptation to suppress the fact, that the church of Rome had instigated a bloody persecution, though they might not have agreed with him in supposing the sufferers to be persons of eminently pure faith.

The reader may, however, like to see what the pope really did say to the empress, and therefore I will translate as literally as I can, all which can possibly be supposed to be connected with the matter in question.

"Nicolas, Bishop, Servant of Servants, to the most beloved daughter of God, Theodora, once an earthly empress, but now spiritually united to Him who is the Heavenly Potentate.

"Accurately and carefully calling to mind your excellencies, endowed with which you have appeared in these days second to none of the empresses who have preceded you; and in which, especially in the cause of religion, you are found inferior to none; we cease not to offer unbounded thanks to Almighty God by whose gift you have received these things,

* Ann. 866. §. XIX.

“and to bless His Holy Name. And we continually set forth,
 “in our converse with the faithful, the praise of your pious pro-
 “ceedings for the imitation of the hearers. You, indeed, even
 “in the life-time of your husband, who held opinions contrary
 “to the laws of the church, did not fear to believe what was
 “sound, and to maintain what was right. You, I say, perse-
 “vering in orthodox religion, instructed your only son to follow,
 “not the steps of his earthly, but of his heavenly Father. But
 “who is sufficient to set forth the excellency of your proceed-
 “ings, or the brave acts of your reformatations? For when you
 “ruled alone, the Lord co-operating, you protected the church
 “not only from a visible enemy, but also, with not less than
 “masculine vigour, from an invisible enemy, that is from error;
 “and like a sun-beam drove away the cloud of false doctrine
 “from the face of the church. The heretics found in you a
 “manly courage; and astonished at your invincible strength,
 “doubted whether you were a woman. Why was this but
 “because you followed the doctrines of the Apostolic See and
 “received the admonitions of the patriarch of Constantinople
 “with whom the Romish Church was in communion,” &c.

In the rest of the letter, there is not, I think, a word
 which the most ingenious, or prejudiced, reader could twist
 into a reference to the Paulicians; and it appears to me
 equally plain, that there is none in that part which I have
 transcribed.

I must, however, add, that there seems to me to be a
 manifest absurdity, in supposing that the pope could intend
 to refer to the Paulicians, or think of selecting such a topic
 for his letter of congratulation, and consolation, to the
 cloistered, and, in fact, imprisoned, empress. If he had
 written to her some twenty years before, when in the
 plenitude of power, she had just sent forth her agents to
 convert or destroy the heretics—or, if at a later period, he
 had been chronicling her acts for the menology—some
 encomium would not have been unnatural; but to write to
 her about the Paulicians, when, whether they had once
 been martyrs or no, they had certainly become rebels—
 while they were unsubdued, rampant and terrible—when

her son, still living, had been defeated, and disgraced, and obliged to fly before their arms—to have written to her of the Paulicians, in such circumstances, would surely have been going out of his way, to refer to a painful topic. Whether at her first interference with the Paulicians, she found them, or made them, rebels—that is, whether she had excited the fierce and threatening war which then raged, or whether she had only been unable to prevent it—in either case, “the glorious exploit,” as Milner terms it, must have been touched, if necessary, with some delicacy; and not by the broad mockery of telling her that the terrified heretics were “astonished at her invincible strength,” and that, like a sun-beam, she had chased away the cloud from the church.

Thus far of the Paulicians, as to their claim to be considered as the witnesses of God against Antichrist; and of the supposed interference of the pope, in the persecution which they suffered. I proceed now to enquire whether the Albigenses of Lombardy, and the south of France, were not (as some writers have supposed) their descendants; and, with this view, I have stated the doctrine of the Paulicians more fully than might have been necessary, either to remove the false colouring of Milner, or the absurd attempt to set them up as witnesses against the papacy. This statement of their doctrine, I wish the reader to keep in mind, and to compare, with what will be hereafter laid before him.

SECTION IV.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ALBIGENSES.

“I CANNOT,” says Mr. Milner, in reference to Gibbon’s account of the Paulicians, “follow the learned author, to whom I owe much for this account, in his conjectures

“ concerning this people's dispersion throughout the European provinces. Nor does there seem any good evidence of the Waldenses owing their origin to the Paulicians. Such speculations are too doubtful to satisfy the minds of those, who prefer the solid evidence of facts to the conjectural ebullitions of a warm imagination.”

Milner does not appear to have considered, that what, if he had stated it, must have proceeded from a warm imagination, might in Gibbon's case, be the offspring of learning, and sound judgment; because Gibbon was familiarly acquainted with facts, respecting which it would be too much to say, that Milner was even imperfectly informed. However, having dismissed one of his guides with this flippant remark, and said not a word of the other, who maintained the same opinion, Milner seems to think it only necessary to add his belief, that there is no proof that the *Waldenses* were descended from the Paulicians.

Now, this was not asserted by either of his guides, both of whom understood the matter somewhat better than he did; and, certainly, it is not my intention to maintain it. I do not believe that the *Waldenses* were so descended; but it seems to me quite impossible, for any man who reads merely what is advanced by Gibbon, and Mosheim, to doubt that the sect, popularly called *Albigenses*, were descendants of the Paulicians; and, like them, (that is to the same, or about the same, extent—for there is no use in quibbling about words) *Manicheans*.” p. 83.

[*Extract No. II. from p. 149.*]

Roger de Hoveden tells us, that when that which he calls the Arian heresy, had thus revived in the province of Thoulouse, the Kings of France and England, being excited by zeal for the christian faith, determined to go there in person, and drive out the heretics; but after a little

her son, still living, had been defeated, and disgraced, and obliged to fly before their arms—to have written to her of the Paulicians, in such circumstances, would surely have been going out of his way, to refer to a painful topic. Whether at her first interference with the Paulicians, she found them, or made them, rebels—that is, whether she had excited the fierce and threatening war which then raged, or whether she had only been unable to prevent it—in either case, “the glorious exploit,” as Milner terms it, must have been touched, if necessary, with some delicacy; and not by the broad mockery of telling her that the terrified heretics were “astonished at her invincible strength,” and that, like a sun-beam, she had chased away the cloud from the church.

Thus far of the Paulicians, as to their claim to be considered as the witnesses of God against Antichrist; and of the supposed interference of the pope, in the persecution which they suffered. I proceed now to enquire whether the Albigenses of Lombardy, and the south of France, were not (as some writers have supposed) their descendants; and, with this view, I have stated the doctrine of the Paulicians more fully than might have been necessary, either to remove the false colouring of Milner, or the absurd attempt to set them up as witnesses against the papacy. This statement of their doctrine, I wish the reader to keep in mind, and to compare, with what will be hereafter laid before him.

SECTION IV.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ALBIGENSES.

“I CANNOT,” says Mr. Milner, in reference to Gibbon’s account of the Paulicians, “follow the learned author, to whom I owe much for this account, in his conjectures

“ concerning this people’s dispersion throughout the European provinces. Nor does there seem any good evidence of the Waldenses owing their origin to the Paulicians. Such speculations are too doubtful to satisfy the minds of those, who prefer the solid evidence of facts to the conjectural ebullitions of a warm imagination.”

Milner does not appear to have considered, that what, if he had stated it, must have proceeded from a warm imagination, might in Gibbon’s case, be the offspring of learning, and sound judgment; because Gibbon was familiarly acquainted with facts, respecting which it would be too much to say, that Milner was even imperfectly informed. However, having dismissed one of his guides with this flippant remark, and said not a word of the other, who maintained the same opinion, Milner seems to think it only necessary to add his belief, that there is no proof that the *Waldenses* were descended from the Paulicians.

Now, this was not asserted by either of his guides, both of whom understood the matter somewhat better than he did; and, certainly, it is not my intention to maintain it. I do not believe that the *Waldenses* were so descended; but it seems to me quite impossible, for any man who reads merely what is advanced by Gibbon, and Mosheim, to doubt that the sect, popularly called *Albigenses*, were descendants of the Paulicians; and, like them, (that is to the same, or about the same, extent—for there is no use in quibbling about words) *Manicheans*.” p. 83.

[*Extract No. II. from p. 149.*]

Roger de Hoveden tells us, that when that which he calls the Arian heresy, had thus revived in the province of Thoulouse, the Kings of France and England, being excited by zeal for the christian faith, determined to go there in person, and drive out the heretics; but after a little

her son, still living, had been defeated, and disgraced, and obliged to fly before their arms—to have written to her of the Paulicians, in such circumstances, would surely have been going out of his way, to refer to a painful topic. Whether at her first interference with the Paulicians, she found them, or made them, rebels—that is, whether she had excited the fierce and threatening war which then raged, or whether she had only been unable to prevent it—in either case, “the glorious exploit,” as Milner terms it, must have been touched, if necessary, with some delicacy; and not by the broad mockery of telling her that the terrified heretics were “astonished at her invincible strength,” and that, like a sun-beam, she had chased away the cloud from the church.

Thus far of the Paulicians, as to their claim to be considered as the witnesses of God against Antichrist; and of the supposed interference of the pope, in the persecution which they suffered. I proceed now to enquire whether the Albigenses of Lombardy, and the south of France, were not (as some writers have supposed) their descendants; and, with this view, I have stated the doctrine of the Paulicians more fully than might have been necessary, either to remove the false colouring of Milner, or the absurd attempt to set them up as witnesses against the papacy. This statement of their doctrine, I wish the reader to keep in mind, and to compare, with what will be hereafter laid before him.

SECTION IV.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ALBIGENSES.

“I CANNOT,” says Mr. Milner, in reference to Gibbon’s account of the Paulicians, “follow the learned author, to “whom I owe much for this account, in his conjectures

"Baronius." This is not to be wondered at, as the account of Baronius is merely, and professedly, an extract from Hoveden's Annals;* but it does not appear to me to warrant Milner's statement, on one very important point. He says, that, after the condemnation of Peter Moranus, "many others abjured their heresies; but some, refusing "to take the oaths of *subjection*, were excommunicated." It may suit the character of the Witnesses, to put the matter in this light; but, I apprehend, it is done at the expense of truth; for I cannot find that they were required to take any "oaths of subjection." From the foregoing letters, indeed, it does not clearly appear what was the nature of the oath required of these persons; though we might guess, from what took place on other similar occasions. At the Council of Lombers, of which we have just had an account, the heretics were called upon to swear that they believed as they professed;† the same had just been required from Peter Moranus;‡ and we might naturally suppose (especially as we see that the Cardinal did not give them credit for sincerity in their confession) that it was a similar oath which was required from these persons. Indeed, Roger de Hoveden (to whom we are indebted for the letters, and who is, I believe, the only authority on the subject) expressly says that it was so—that the Cardinal, and Bishops, "directed that they should swear that they believed with the heart, what they had confessed with the mouth."§ It is evident, I think, that when their examiners found these

* [Baronius in fact introduces the extract by saying, "Quid autem actum fuerit, Rogerius in Annalibus Anglorum Scriptor accuratissimus ita describit:" and the extract follows in *italics*, as usual, to distinguish it. One can only suppose, either that Milner had not seen Baronius, to whom he refers, or else, that he did not know "Rogerius" to be the same person as "Hoveden." The latter is perhaps the more probable.]

† See before, p. 144, "Interrogavit etiam eos Episcopus prædictus, si jurarent se tenere fidem istam et credere."

‡ See before, p. 156.

§ "Præciperunt, quod ipsi jurassent se ita corde credere, sicut ore confitebantur." p. 238.

while, it appeared to them that it would be more to the purpose * to send some wise men, who might convert the heretics by preaching, than to go themselves. They sent, therefore, Peter, Cardinal of the title of St. Chrysogonus, and Legate of the Apostolic See, the Archbishops of Bourges and Narbonne, Reginald, Bishop of Bath, John, Bishop of Poitiers, Henry, Abbot of Clairvaux, and many other ecclesiastics, that they might either convert the heretics, or, having convicted them of heresy, might excommunicate them. He then goes on to give an account of their proceedings on the occasion; but, as the Legate and Abbot, have each left a letter on the subject, it may be most satisfactory, and, I think, most interesting, to give the story as they have related it; and, as I think that the facts of the case have been misrepresented, and false conclusions have been drawn, from a partial view of these documents, I shall give them at full length. For the sake, however, of making them more intelligible, I shall take the liberty of inverting the order in which Roger de Hoveden has placed them, and give the Abbot's letter first.

[Having given the letters, which occupy more than sixteen pages of small and close printing, I added]

It appears to me, as I have already stated, that the facts related in these letters have been misrepresented; and that false conclusions have been drawn from them.

That the reader may judge, let him turn to Milner's account of this business.† He professes to have derived his information from Baronius, "a very determined enemy of the Waldenses;" and he tells us, that "the account of "our English historian, Hoveden, is similar to that of

* "Videbatur eis plus posse proficere." Milner, in his account of the matter, Vol. III. p. 482, says, they "thought it more *prudent* to employ preachers." I suppose there is some meaning in this which I do not discover.

† Vol. III. p. 483.

fession, they were dealt with as their enemies represent? Does he mean that these Albigenses made a truly protestant confession, "testifying against the demonolatrous apostacy," and that their false enemies, instead of ordering them off to the stake, told them it was sufficiently laudable, and catholic, and contented themselves with excommunicating them, because they would not swear?

Or, by "their enemies," does he mean the Count of Thoulouse, and the others, who confronted them? They "gave no proof of sincerity, *that we know of*"—Well, but on the other hand, do "we know of" any reason why they should bring such charges against innocent persons, who *really held* such purely popish opinions as these persons professed? Why should they persecute people who were as good papists as themselves?

In short, if we believe their enemies, they were Manicheans—if we believe themselves, they were Papists—which are we to believe? perhaps, as we are not called upon immediately to decide, it may be as well to suspend our belief of either party, until we have made some farther progress in our enquiry.

[*Extract No. III. from p. 343.*]

About the year 1147, Saint Bernard received a letter from Evervinus, Præpositus of Steinfield, near Cologne, respecting some heretics who had been recently discovered, and burned, in that city. He give them no name, except that he says they called themselves apostles; and Bernard seems to imply that they did not assume, and were not known by, any particular appellation.* This abbot directed

* Quære ab illis suæ sectæ auctorem; neminem dabunt. quo nomine istos titulove censebis? nullo. *Serm. in Cant. LXVI. Vol. I. 1494.* He says, indeed, in the same discourse, "se. . . . apostolicos nominant;" but it does not seem clear that they took this title. At all events they were distinct from the sect of the Apostolics.

alleged heretics, making a confession, which appeared to them (as the Cardinal himself expresses it) "sufficiently laudable and catholic," they suspected them of dissimulation; and, indeed, I do not see how those who look upon them as the Witnesses, can avoid admitting that they made a confession highly agreeable to Antichrist; and only incurred his displeasure, because they would not confirm it with an oath. If Antichrist persecuted these Witnesses, it was not because he disapproved of their testimony; but, because he did not give them credit for believing it themselves.

In fact, this document, if it proves anything, proves too much; for (to say nothing of "subjection," or any other point) the heretics expressly declared their belief in the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, as held by their judges. After Peter Moranus had just been condemned on that very point, can we doubt that it was closely pressed, and explicitly answered? Indeed, looking at the whole matter, in what one point of view do these alleged heretics, appear as witnesses against the false doctrines of Papacy, or as champions of any one truth that was not maintained by the church of Rome? "They answered," says Roger de Hoveden, "concerning *all the articles of faith*, as soundly, and circumspectly, as if they had been most christian people."* Truly, it seems that the Cardinal, and his companions, thought so. Did these Witnesses say an offensive word, about the arrogant folly—the impious usurpation—of him who called himself Christ's Vicar on earth? a word about the worship of saints and images? about the fiction of purgatory, or the idolatry of the mass? Strange witnesses! Yet, if we suspect them of dissembling, we are charged with wronging good men; and that too, most inexcusably, when we have such authentic documents as the Waldensian records before us. Milner thus lectures Mr. Berington:

* "De articulis fidei Christianæ examinati, responderunt super omnibus articulis fidei ita sane et circumspecte ac si Christianissimi essent."

“ on this occasion, I cannot but disapprove of the rashness
 “ or the prejudices of an able historian, who has already
 “ fallen under our notice. He says, that the Albigenses,
 “ being examined, denied the Manichean doctrine of the
 “ two principles, though charged on that account with
 “ falsehoods by their enemies: and this author believes
 “ these same enemies, who gave no proof of sincerity, that
 “ we know of, and accuses the Albigenses of dissimulation,
 “ though such numbers of them were suffering continually
 “ for their principles. The man, who undertakes to be an
 “ historian, ought to be acquainted with the writings and
 “ evidences which are produced on both sides of a contro-
 “ verted subject, so far as materials can be procured. If
 “ the author before us had read with the least attention the
 “ Waldensian records, he would never have asserted, that
 “ the Waldenses were legitimate descendants of the sect of
 “ Manes.” Vol. III. p. 484.

Whether Mr. Berington charges the *Waldenses* with being descendants of the sect of Manes, or whether Milner only means that he brings that charge against persons, whom he does himself call Waldenses, I do not know; for I have not the opportunity of referring to his book; but I must remind the reader, that I bring no such charge against the Waldenses; and that, although (as I cannot be responsible for the language of others) the name of *Waldenses* may have been used in reference to this business, I believe it had no more to do with them, than it had with the Brahmins of India.

As to Mr. Berington's accusing the Albigenses of dissimulation, I have already said, that it seems to me to be the only way by which their friends can clear them of being part and parcel of Antichrist; and as to the proof of their sincerity, it may suit the character of witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, to say that “ *such numbers* of them were *continually* suffering for their principles;” but is it true that they were so suffering? Count Raymond's letter gives rather a different view of the matter; and the Abbot Henry represents them as the dominant power in

Thoulouse.* Had Milner got any other "original records," whereby to refute the "modern historian," except the "Waldensian records?" and would not they, in his estimation, convict these persons of most grievous falsehood, in professing their belief of the popish doctrine of transubstantiation? Had he any "original records" of the persecutions in which such numbers were "continually suffering" for a faith which (unless they belied it) was considered "sufficiently laudable, and catholic," by their enemies? If he had, I wish he had referred to them.

But Mr. Berington "believes these same enemies, who gave no proof of their sincerity that we know of." I really do not know what Milner means, by their "sincerity." Does he mean to doubt, that they were sincere, in their belief of the popish principles, which they professed? or that they could be suspected of any insincerity at all analogous to that which has been (whether justly or not) charged on these Albigenses? I think that could not be his meaning. Does he mean then, that, being persons of whose love of truth we have no proof, we ought not to believe what they say? This, to be sure, is going a good way, and looks a little like prejudice; but suppose that, for sake of argument, we grant it; what would he have us *disbelieve*? Did he think their letters a mere romance, and that they never went to Thoulouse at all? No—he believes "the account of the barbarous treatment of the rich old gentleman of Thoulouse," which "confirms the truth of Perrin's narrative of the like persecutions, and demonstrates, from the testimony even of Roman writers, that the horrors of papal tyranny, have not been misrepresented in general, by protestant authors"—Well, then, so far, we are to believe—and, I repeat, what does he want us to disbelieve? Is it the fact, that these persons made any confession at all, or that they made *such* a confession as their enemies record, or that, having made such a con-

* "Principabantur in populo, dominabantur in clero."

heretics, and delivered to the secular arm to be punished. The King, at the instigation of the clergy, commanded them to be branded with a red hot iron on the forehead, to be whipped through the streets of Oxford, and having their clothes cut short by their girdles, to be turned out into the open fields, all persons being forbidden to afford them any shelter or relief under the severest penalties. This cruel sentence was executed in its utmost rigour; and it being the depth of winter, all these unhappy persons perished with cold and hunger." Book III. ch. II. §. 3.

Milner, who seems to have followed the "modern historian" implicitly, without troubling himself about the "original records," which were referred to, relates the story in much the same way;* and then adds—

"They had made one female convert in England, who, through fear of similar punishment, recanted. The whole number of the Germans remained, however, patient, serene, and composed, repeating, 'Blessed are those, who are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.' Their teacher Gerard, that he might be distinguished from the rest, had an additional stigma on his chin.

"What a darkness must at that time have filled this island! A wise and sagacious King, a renowned university, the whole body of the clergy and laity, all united *in expelling Christ from their coasts!* Brief as is the account of the Martyrs, it is *sufficiently evident that they were the martyrs of Christ.* Driven most probably from home by the rage of persecution, they had brought the *light and power of the Gospel* with them into England; and so totally senseless and corrupt was our nation, that none received it."

* Vol. III. p. 424. I have not the edition of Henry's History, to which Milner refers; but, in the fourth edition (8vo. 1805.) the authorities stand thus, "W. Neubrig. l. 2. c. 13. Item, p. 631. J. Brompt. col. 1050;" the latter reference being to the *column* of the *Decem Scriptores*, edited by Twysden. Milner's reference is, "Neubrig. Brompt. Collect. See Henry's Hist. of Eng. Vol. III. p. 240." For the particulars mentioned by him, which are not contained in Henry's History, I suppose that Milner was indebted to Mr. Berington.

her son, still living, had been defeated, and disgraced, and obliged to fly before their arms—to have written to her of the Paulicians, in such circumstances, would surely have been going out of his way, to refer to a painful topic. Whether at her first interference with the Paulicians, she found them, or made them, rebels—that is, whether she had excited the fierce and threatening war which then raged, or whether she had only been unable to prevent it—in either case, “the glorious exploit,” as Milner terms it, must have been touched, if necessary, with some delicacy; and not by the broad mockery of telling her that the terrified heretics were “astonished at her invincible strength,” and that, like a sun-beam, she had chased away the cloud from the church.

Thus far of the Paulicians, as to their claim to be considered as the witnesses of God against Antichrist; and of the supposed interference of the pope, in the persecution which they suffered. I proceed now to enquire whether the Albigenses of Lombardy, and the south of France, were not (as some writers have supposed) their descendants; and, with this view, I have stated the doctrine of the Paulicians more fully than might have been necessary, either to remove the false colouring of Milner, or the absurd attempt to set them up as witnesses against the papacy. This statement of their doctrine, I wish the reader to keep in mind, and to compare, with what will be hereafter laid before him.

SECTION IV.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ALBIGENSES.

“I CANNOT,” says Mr. Milner, in reference to Gibbon’s account of the Paulicians, “follow the learned author, to “whom I owe much for this account, in his conjectures

ful, let the reader of Milner's History judge. In the present case, all that he supposed himself to know of these people was, that they denied the doctrines of purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the invocation of the saints, and that they were "patient, serene, and composed," (which latter is, as far as I know, an addition of his own) and on this he built his judgment.

But what evidence have we, that these persons said anything about *purgatory*, or *prayers for the dead*, or the *invocation of Saints*?* If, indeed, they were Publicans,

against Jovinian, because, from carelessly reading the translation, he was led to suppose that Mosheim had spoken too well of him. "I admire," he says, "the *positiveness* of Mosheim, in deciding so *peremptorily* for the character of a man, of whose writings nothing has come down to us, but a single sentence so barbarous and doubtful." Now, what had Mosheim so positively, and peremptorily, said? I really think that a reader of Milner would be more likely to form a favourable opinion of Jovinian, than a reader of Mosheim. The former writer, indeed, states the matter as doubtful, but finds "that which strongly inclines him to hope" that the real character of Jovinian was good; the latter is so far from positively, and peremptorily, deciding in his favour, that he expresses suspicion, but gives no opinion at all; and Milner should have known, before he "censured" Mosheim, that the "*worthy opposer*," and the "*judicious opinions*," and "*judicious reasonings*," of Jovinian, were merely flourishes of the translator, who was wont thus to embellish his author, though sometimes at the expence of fidelity and truth. Mosheim, speaking of Aerius, says, "*Videtur vir hic religionem ad priscam simplicitatem revocare voluisse: quod consilium in se spectatum pulchrum est, tametsi in causis et agendi ratione forte quædam reprehendi possint. Plures hujus generis homines hac ætate erant, qui progressum superstitionum et errorum de vera religionis natura moleste ferentes, ei sese objiciebant, sed laboris hunc unum fructum capiebant, ut infamia notarentur. Emi- net inter eos Jovinianus, monachus Italus.*" *Sæc. IV. P. II. Cap. iii. §. 22. p. 173.*

* The only colour (it is no authority) for Henry's statement, is a note of Picard's, in Hearne's edition of William of Newbury, which Henry refers to by "Item, p. 631." Picard quotes a MS. of Ralph of Coggeshall, in which he speaks of the persecution of the Publicans generally; and, among others, of these. He afterwards (but with no special reference to them) details the doctrines of the Sect. His state-

Thoulouse.* Had Milner got any other "original records," whereby to refute the "modern historian," except the "Waldensian records?" and would not they, in his estimation, convict these persons of most grievous falsehood, in professing their belief of the popish doctrine of transubstantiation? Had he any "original records" of the persecutions in which such numbers were "continually suffering" for a faith which (unless they belied it) was considered "sufficiently laudable, and catholic," by their enemies? If he had, I wish he had referred to them.

But Mr. Berington "believes these same enemies, who gave no proof of their sincerity that we know of." I really do not know what Milner means, by their "sincerity." Does he mean to doubt, that they were sincere, in their belief of the popish principles, which they professed? or that they could be suspected of any insincerity at all analogous to that which has been (whether justly or not) charged on these Albigenses? I think that could not be his meaning. Does he mean then, that, being persons of whose love of truth we have no proof, we ought not to believe what they say? This, to be sure, is going a good way, and looks a little like prejudice; but suppose that, for sake of argument, we grant it; what would he have us *disbelieve*? Did he think their letters a mere romance, and that they never went to Thoulouse at all? No—he believes "the account of the barbarous treatment of the rich old gentleman of Thoulouse," which "confirms the truth of Perrin's narrative of the like persecutions, and demonstrates, from the testimony even of Roman writers, that the horrors of papal tyranny, have not been misrepresented in general, by protestant authors"—Well, then, so far, we are to believe—and, I repeat, what does he want us to disbelieve? Is it the fact, that these persons made any confession at all, or that they made *such* a confession as their enemies record, or that, having made such a con-

* "Principabantur in populo, dominabantur in clero."

cession, they were dealt with as their enemies represent? Does he mean that these Albigenses made a truly protestant confession, "testifying against the demonolatrous apostacy," and that their false enemies, instead of ordering them off to the stake, told them it was sufficiently laudable, and catholic, and contented themselves with excommunicating them, because they would not swear?

Or, by "their enemies," does he mean the Count of Thoulouse, and the others, who confronted them? They "gave no proof of sincerity, *that we know of*"—Well, but on the other hand, do "we know of" any reason why they should bring such charges against innocent persons, who *really held* such purely popish opinions as these persons professed? Why should they persecute people who were as good papists as themselves?

In short, if we believe their enemies, they were Manicheans—if we believe themselves, they were Papists—which are we to believe? perhaps, as we are not called upon immediately to decide, it may be as well to suspend our belief of either party, until we have made some farther progress in our enquiry.

[*Extract No. III. from p. 343.*]

About the year 1147, Saint Bernard received a letter from Evervinus, Præpositus of Steinfield, near Cologne, respecting some heretics who had been recently discovered, and burned, in that city. He give them no name, except that he says they called themselves apostles; and Bernard seems to imply that they did not assume, and were not known by, any particular appellation.* This abbot directed

* Quære ab illis suæ sectæ auctorem; neminem dabunt. quo nomine istos titulove censebis? nullo. *Serm. in Cant.* LXVI. Vol. I. 1494. He says, indeed, in the same discourse, "se. . . apostolicos nominant;" but it does not seem clear that they took this title. At all events they were distinct from the sect of the Apostolics.

two sermons against the errors of these heretics, which seem to have been evidently suggested by the letter of Evervinus; though, from some expressions, I am led to think that he was not indebted to that letter exclusively for his knowledge of the sect.

The letter has been printed by Mabillon,* and as it may throw light on our present subject, I shall give that part which has been translated by Allix,† in his words. He omits the introduction, and I see nothing in it worth noticing for our purpose, except that Evervinus calls upon Bernard to come forward against “the *new* heretics.”‡

“There have been lately some heretics discovered amongst us, near Cologne, whereof some with satisfaction returned again to the Church: two of these, viz. one that was a Bishop amongst them, and his companions, openly opposed us in the assembly of the clergy and laity, the Lord Archbishop himself being present, with many of the nobility, maintaining their heresy from the words of Christ and the Apostles. But when they saw they could go no further, they desired that a day might be appointed for them, upon which they might bring along with them men skilful in their belief, promising to return to the church, provided they should find their masters defective in answering what was opposed to them; but that otherwise they would rather die than depart from their judgment. Upon this their declaration, after that for three days together they had been admonished, and found unwilling to repent, they were seized by the people, being incited by overmuch zeal, and put into the fire and burnt; and” &c. §

* Op. Bern. Vol. I. c. 1487.

† Ch. of Pied. 153.

‡ “Contra novos hereticos, qui circumquaque jam fere per omnes ecclesias ebulliunt de puteo abyssi quasi jam princeps illorum incipiat dissolvi, et instet dies domini.”

§ Allix has omitted Evervinus’s declaration that this was done against his will. His words are, “rapti sunt a populis nimio zelo permotis, nobis tamen invitis: et in ignem positi, atque cremati.” Milner, who refers to Allix for the story, and who seems to have taken his extracts of the letter from Allix’s translation, with such verbal alterations as he saw fit to make, follows implicitly on this point. Vol. III. 378. His

[*Extract No. IV. from p. 365.*]

GULIELMUS NEUBRIGENSIS. A.D. 1197.

The account which this writer has given of the Publicans, who were condemned at the Council of Oxford, in 1160, has been already referred to, at p. 90 and 138. With the short statement of John Brompton (who appears merely to have abridged from William of Newbury) and a still shorter notice by Radulphus de Diceto, it forms, I believe, the only account which we have of the matter. I shall give all that I can find on the subject in these writers among the authorities; and here only translate what immediately refers to

following the "modern historian," and not the "original record," in this case was the less excusable, because he seems to have had access to it. He tells us, p. 331, "I use the Parisian edition of Mabillon." [As our present enquiry respects the "value" of Milner's History, it may be proper here to notice the "verbal alterations," to which I have alluded above. The reader will observe, that Milner gives the passage in inverted commas, and refers at the end of it to, "Allix, Churches of Piedmont, p. 140." It seems to me that under these circumstances he was not at liberty to make *any* alteration whatever; and I must add that, the mere discovery that any writer had done such a thing, would so destroy my confidence in him, as that I should consider his work, not merely of no value, but, as a mischievous and injurious thing, which ought to be exposed. Let him, if he will, quote laxly from memory, and tell us so—let him mistake, and blunder as much as he pleases—but deliberately to alter the language of a writer, whose words one professes to quote, (supposing one could be sure of always exactly preserving the idea) is something which I cannot reconcile with the fidelity which appears to me to be the most important qualification for a writer of history.

But if others are disposed to give greater licence in this respect, has Milner made a good use of it? Has he corrected Allix's translation? I have already said that he has not restored—I am very willing to believe he did not miss—the words in which the Prior declares that the heretics were burnt contrary to his will; but beside this, has he not softened down Allix's translation of the words in which Evervinus speaks of the proceedings of the people. Is "the people in excess of zeal," a better translation of "*populis nimio zelo permotis*" than "the people being incited by overmuch zeal." If there is no shade of difference

her son, still living, had been defeated, and disgraced, and obliged to fly before their arms—to have written to her of the Paulicians, in such circumstances, would surely have been going out of his way, to refer to a painful topic. Whether at her first interference with the Paulicians, she found them, or made them, rebels—that is, whether she had excited the fierce and threatening war which then raged, or whether she had only been unable to prevent it—in either case, “the glorious exploit,” as Milner terms it, must have been touched, if necessary, with some delicacy; and not by the broad mockery of telling her that the terrified heretics were “astonished at her invincible strength,” and that, like a sun-beam, she had chased away the cloud from the church.

Thus far of the Paulicians, as to their claim to be considered as the witnesses of God against Antichrist; and of the supposed interference of the pope, in the persecution which they suffered. I proceed now to enquire whether the Albigenses of Lombardy, and the south of France, were not (as some writers have supposed) their descendants; and, with this view, I have stated the doctrine of the Paulicians more fully than might have been necessary, either to remove the false colouring of Milner, or the absurd attempt to set them up as witnesses against the papacy. This statement of their doctrine, I wish the reader to keep in mind, and to compare, with what will be hereafter laid before him.

SECTION IV.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ALBIGENSES.

“I CANNOT,” says Mr. Milner, in reference to Gibbon’s account of the Paulicians, “follow the learned author, to whom I owe much for this account, in his conjectures

heretics, and delivered to the secular arm to be punished. The King, at the instigation of the clergy, commanded them to be branded with a red hot iron on the forehead, to be whipped through the streets of Oxford, and having their clothes cut short by their girdles, to be turned out into the open fields, all persons being forbidden to afford them any shelter or relief under the severest penalties. This cruel sentence was executed in its utmost rigour; and it being the depth of winter, all these unhappy persons perished with cold and hunger." Book III. ch. II. §. 3.

Milner, who seems to have followed the "modern historian" implicitly, without troubling himself about the "original records," which were referred to, relates the story in much the same way;* and then adds—

"They had made one female convert in England, who, through fear of similar punishment, recanted. The whole number of the Germans remained, however, patient, serene, and composed, repeating, 'Blessed are those, who are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.' Their teacher Gerard, that he might be distinguished from the rest, had an additional stigma on his chin.

"What a darkness must at that time have filled this island! A wise and sagacious King, a renowned university, the whole body of the clergy and laity, all united *in expelling Christ from their coasts!* Brief as is the account of the Martyrs, it is *sufficiently evident that they were the martyrs of Christ.* Driven most probably from home by the rage of persecution, they had brought the *light and power of the Gospel* with them into England; and so totally senseless and corrupt was our nation, that none received it."

* Vol. III. p. 424. I have not the edition of Henry's History, to which Milner refers; but, in the fourth edition (8vo. 1805.) the authorities stand thus, "W. Neubrig. l. 2. c. 13. Item, p. 631. J. Brompt. col. 1050;" the latter reference being to the *column* of the *Decem Scriptores*, edited by Twysden. Milner's reference is, "Neubrig. Brompt. Collect. See Henry's Hist. of Eng. Vol. III. p. 240." For the particulars mentioned by him, which are not contained in Henry's History, I suppose that Milner was indebted to Mr. Berington.

her son, still living, had been defeated, and disgraced, and obliged to fly before their arms—to have written to her of the Paulicians, in such circumstances, would surely have been going out of his way, to refer to a painful topic. Whether at her first interference with the Paulicians, she found them, or made them, rebels—that is, whether she had excited the fierce and threatening war which then raged, or whether she had only been unable to prevent it—in either case, “the glorious exploit,” as Milner terms it, must have been touched, if necessary, with some delicacy; and not by the broad mockery of telling her that the terrified heretics were “astonished at her invincible strength,” and that, like a sun-beam, she had chased away the cloud from the church.

Thus far of the Paulicians, as to their claim to be considered as the witnesses of God against Antichrist; and of the supposed interference of the pope, in the persecution which they suffered. I proceed now to enquire whether the Albigenses of Lombardy, and the south of France, were not (as some writers have supposed) their descendants; and, with this view, I have stated the doctrine of the Paulicians more fully than might have been necessary, either to remove the false colouring of Milner, or the absurd attempt to set them up as witnesses against the papacy. This statement of their doctrine, I wish the reader to keep in mind, and to compare, with what will be hereafter laid before him.

SECTION IV.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ALBIGENSES.

“I CANNOT,” says Mr. Milner, in reference to Gibbon’s account of the Paulicians, “follow the learned author, to “whom I owe much for this account, in his conjectures

[*Extract No. IV. from p. 365.*]

GULIELMUS NEUBRIGENSIS. A.D. 1197.

The account which this writer has given of the Publicans, who were condemned at the Council of Oxford, in 1160, has been already referred to, at p. 90 and 138. With the short statement of John Brompton (who appears merely to have abridged from William of Newbury) and a still shorter notice by Radulphus de Diceto, it forms, I believe, the only account which we have of the matter. I shall give all that I can find on the subject in these writers among the authorities; and here only translate what immediately refers to

following the "modern historian," and not the "original record," in this case was the less excusable, because he seems to have had access to it. He tells us, p. 331, "I use the Parisian edition of Mabillon." [As our present enquiry respects the "value" of Milner's History, it may be proper here to notice the "verbal alterations," to which I have alluded above. The reader will observe, that Milner gives the passage in inverted commas, and refers at the end of it to, "Allix, Churches of Piedmont, p. 140." It seems to me that under these circumstances he was not at liberty to make *any* alteration whatever; and I must add that, the mere discovery that any writer had done such a thing, would so destroy my confidence in him, as that I should consider his work, not merely of no value, but, as a mischievous and injurious thing, which ought to be exposed. Let him, if he will, quote laxly from memory, and tell us so—let him mistake, and blunder as much as he pleases—but deliberately to alter the language of a writer, whose words one professes to quote, (supposing one could be sure of always exactly preserving the idea) is something which I cannot reconcile with the fidelity which appears to me to be the most important qualification for a writer of history.

But if others are disposed to give greater licence in this respect, has Milner made a good use of it? Has he corrected Allix's translation? I have already said that he has not restored—I am very willing to believe he did not miss—the words in which the Prior declares that the heretics were burnt contrary to his will; but beside this, has he not softened down Allix's translation of the words in which Evervinus speaks of the proceedings of the people. Is "the people in excess of zeal," a better translation of "*populis nimio zelo permotis*" than "the people being incited by overmuch zeal." If there is no shade of difference

while, it appeared to them that it would be more to the purpose * to send some wise men, who might convert the heretics by preaching, than to go themselves. They sent therefore, Peter, Cardinal of the title of St. Chrysogonus, and Legate of the Apostolic See, the Archbishops of Bourges and Narbonne, Reginald, Bishop of Bath, John, Bishop of Poitiers, Henry, Abbot of Clairvaux, and many other ecclesiastics, that they might either convert the heretics, or, having convicted them of heresy, might excommunicate them. He then goes on to give an account of their proceedings on the occasion; but, as the Legate and Abbot have each left a letter on the subject, it may be most satisfactory, and, I think, most interesting, to give the story as they have related it; and, as I think that the facts of the case have been misrepresented, and false conclusions have been drawn, from a partial view of these documents, I shall give them at full length. For the sake, however, of making them more intelligible, I shall take the liberty of inverting the order in which Roger de Hoveden has placed them and give the Abbot's letter first.

[Having given the letters, which occupy more than sixteen pages of small and close printing, I added]

It appears to me, as I have already stated, that the facts related in these letters have been misrepresented; and that false conclusions have been drawn from them.

That the reader may judge, let him turn to Milner's account of this business.† He professes to have derived his information from Baronius, "a very determined enemy of the Waldenses;" and he tells us, that "the account of our English historian, Hoveden, is similar to that

* "Videbatur eis plus posse proficere." Milner, in his account of the matter, Vol. III. p. 482, says, they "thought it more prudent to employ preachers." I suppose there is some meaning in this which I do not discover.

† Vol. III. p. 483.

"Baronius." This is not to be wondered at, as the account of Baronius is merely, and professedly, an extract from Hoveden's Annals;* but it does not appear to me to warrant Milner's statement, on one very important point. He says, that, after the condemnation of Peter Moranus, "many others abjured their heresies; but some, refusing "to take the oaths of *subjection*, were excommunicated." It may suit the character of the Witnesses, to put the matter in this light; but, I apprehend, it is done at the expense of truth; for I cannot find that they were required to take any "oaths of subjection." From the foregoing letters, indeed, it does not clearly appear what was the nature of the oath required of these persons; though we might guess, from what took place on other similar occasions. At the Council of Lombers, of which we have just had an account, the heretics were called upon to swear that they believed as they professed;† the same had just been required from Peter Moranus;‡ and we might naturally suppose (especially as we see that the Cardinal did not give them credit for sincerity in their confession) that it was a similar oath which was required from these persons. Indeed, Roger de Hoveden (to whom we are indebted for the letters, and who is, I believe, the only authority on the subject) expressly says that it was so—that the Cardinal, and Bishops, "directed that they should swear that they believed with the heart, what they had confessed with the mouth."§ It is evident, I think, that when their examiners found these

* [Baronius in fact introduces the extract by saying, "Quid autem actum fuerit, Rogerius in Annalibus Anglorum Scriptor accuratissimus ita describit:" and the extract follows in *italics*, as usual, to distinguish it. One can only suppose, either that Milner had not seen Baronius, to whom he refers, or else, that he did not know "Rogerius" to be the same person as "Hoveden." The latter is perhaps the more probable.]

† See before, p. 144, "Interrogavit etiam eos Episcopus prædictus, si jurarent se tenere fidem istam et credere."

‡ See before, p. 156.

§ "Præciperunt, quod ipsi jurassent se ita corde credere, sicut ore confitebantur." p. 238.

while, it appeared to them that it would be more to the purpose * to send some wise men, who might convert the heretics by preaching, than to go themselves. They sent, therefore, Peter, Cardinal of the title of St. Chrysogonus, and Legate of the Apostolic See, the Archbishops of Bourges and Narbonne, Reginald, Bishop of Bath, John, Bishop of Poitiers, Henry, Abbot of Clairvaux, and many other ecclesiastics, that they might either convert the heretics, or, having convicted them of heresy, might excommunicate them. He then goes on to give an account of their proceedings on the occasion; but, as the Legate and Abbot, have each left a letter on the subject, it may be most satisfactory, and, I think, most interesting, to give the story as they have related it; and, as I think that the facts of the case have been misrepresented, and false conclusions have been drawn, from a partial view of these documents, I shall give them at full length. For the sake, however, of making them more intelligible, I shall take the liberty of inverting the order in which Roger de Hoveden has placed them, and give the Abbot's letter first.

[Having given the letters, which occupy more than sixteen pages of small and close printing, I added]

It appears to me, as I have already stated, that the facts related in these letters have been misrepresented; and that false conclusions have been drawn from them.

That the reader may judge, let him turn to Milner's account of this business.† He professes to have derived his information from Baronius, "a very determined enemy of the Waldenses;" and he tells us, that "the account of "our English historian, Hoveden, is similar to that of

* "Videbatur eis plus posse proficere." Milner, in his account of the matter, Vol. III. p. 482, says, they "thought it more *prudent* to employ preachers." I suppose there is some meaning in this which I do not discover.

† Vol. III. p. 483.

"Baronius." This is not be wondered at, as the account of Baronius is merely, and professedly, an extract from Hoveden's Annals;* but it does not appear to me to warrant Milner's statement, on one very important point. He says, that, after the condemnation of Peter Moranus, "many others abjured their heresies; but some, refusing "to take the oaths of *subjection*, were excommunicated." It may suit the character of the Witnesses, to put the matter in this light; but, I apprehend, it is done at the expense of truth; for I cannot find that they were required to take any "oaths of subjection." From the foregoing letters, indeed, it does not clearly appear what was the nature of the oath required of these persons; though we might guess, from what took place on other similar occasions. At the Council of Lombers, of which we have just had an account, the heretics were called upon to swear that they believed as they professed;† the same had just been required from Peter Moranus;‡ and we might naturally suppose (especially as we see that the Cardinal did not give them credit for sincerity in their confession) that it was a similar oath which was required from these persons. Indeed, Roger de Hoveden (to whom we are indebted for the letters, and who is, I believe, the only authority on the subject) expressly says that it was so—that the Cardinal, and Bishops, "directed that they should swear that they believed with the heart, what they had confessed with the mouth."§ It is evident, I think, that when their examiners found these

* [Baronius in fact introduces the extract by saying, "Quid autem actum fuerit, Rogerius in Annalibus Anglorum Scriptor accuratissimus ita describit:" and the extract follows in *italics*, as usual, to distinguish it. One can only suppose, either that Milner had not seen Baronius, to whom he refers, or else, that he did not know "Rogerius" to be the same person as "Hoveden." The latter is perhaps the more probable.]

† See before, p. 144, "Interrogavit etiam eos Episcopus prædictus, si jurarent se tenere fidem istam et credere."

‡ See before, p. 156.

§ "Præciperunt, quod ipsi jurassent se ita corde credere, sicut ore confitebantur." p. 238.

Thoulouse.* Had Milner got any other "original records," whereby to refute the "modern historian," except the "Waldensian records?" and would not they, in his estimation, convict these persons of most grievous falsehood, in professing their belief of the popish doctrine of transubstantiation? Had he any "original records" of the persecutions in which such numbers were "continually suffering" for a faith which (unless they belied it) was considered "sufficiently laudable, and catholic," by their enemies? If he had, I wish he had referred to them.

But Mr. Berington "believes these same enemies, who gave no proof of their sincerity that we know of." I really do not know what Milner means, by their "sincerity." Does he mean to doubt, that they were sincere, in their belief of the popish principles, which they professed? or that they could be suspected of any insincerity at all analogous to that which has been (whether justly or not) charged on these Albigenses? I think that could not be his meaning. Does he mean then, that, being persons of whose love of truth we have no proof, we ought not to believe what they say? This, to be sure, is going a good way, and looks a little like prejudice; but suppose that, for sake of argument, we grant it; what would he have us *disbelieve*? Did he think their letters a mere romance, and that they never went to Thoulouse at all? No—he believes "the account of the barbarous treatment of the rich old gentleman of Thoulouse," which "confirms the truth of Perrin's narrative of the like persecutions, and demonstrates, from the testimony even of Roman writers, that the horrors of papal tyranny, have not been misrepresented in general, by protestant authors"—Well, then, so far, we are to believe—and, I repeat, what does he want us to disbelieve? Is it the fact, that these persons made any confession at all, or that they made *such* a confession as their enemies record, or that, having made such a con-

* "Principabantur in populo, dominabantur in clero."

fession, they were dealt with as their enemies represent? Does he mean that these Albigenses made a truly protestant confession, "testifying against the demonolatrous apostacy," and that their false enemies, instead of ordering them off to the stake, told them it was sufficiently laudable, and catholic, and contented themselves with excommunicating them, because they would not swear?

Or, by "their enemies," does he mean the Count of Thoulouse, and the others, who confronted them? They "gave no proof of sincerity, *that we know of*"—Well, but on the other hand, do "we know of" any reason why they should bring such charges against innocent persons, who *really held* such purely popish opinions as these persons professed? Why should they persecute people who were as good papists as themselves?

In short, if we believe their enemies, they were Manicheans—if we believe themselves, they were Papists—which are we to believe? perhaps, as we are not called upon immediately to decide, it may be as well to suspend our belief of either party, until we have made some farther progress in our enquiry.

[*Extract No. III. from p. 343.*]

About the year 1147, Saint Bernard received a letter from Evervinus, Præpositus of Steinfield, near Cologne, respecting some heretics who had been recently discovered, and burned, in that city. He give them no name, except that he says they called themselves apostles; and Bernard seems to imply that they did not assume, and were not known by, any particular appellation.* This abbot directed

* Quære ab illis suæ sectæ auctorem; neminem dabunt. quo nomine istos titulove censebis? nullo. *Serm. in Cant.* LXVI. Vol. I. 1494. He says, indeed, in the same discourse, "*se. . . . apostolicos nominant;*" but it does not seem clear that they took this title. At all events they were distinct from the sect of the Apostolics.

two sermons against the errors of these heretics, which seem to have been evidently suggested by the letter of Evervinus; though, from some expressions, I am led to think that he was not indebted to that letter exclusively for his knowledge of the sect.

The letter has been printed by Mabillon,* and as it may throw light on our present subject, I shall give that part which has been translated by Allix,† in his words. He omits the introduction, and I see nothing in it worth noticing for our purpose, except that Evervinus calls upon Bernard to come forward against “the new heretics.”‡

“There have been lately some heretics discovered amongst us, near Cologne, whereof some with satisfaction returned again to the Church: two of these, viz. one that was a Bishop amongst them, and his companions, openly opposed us in the assembly of the clergy and laity, the Lord Archbishop himself being present, with many of the nobility, maintaining their heresy from the words of Christ and the Apostles. But when they saw they could go no further, they desired that a day might be appointed for them, upon which they might bring along with them men skilful in their belief, promising to return to the church, provided they should find their masters defective in answering what was opposed to them; but that otherwise they would rather die than depart from their judgment. Upon this their declaration, after that for three days together they had been admonished, and found unwilling to repent, they were seized by the people, being incited by overmuch zeal, and put into the fire and burnt; and” &c. §

* Op. Bern. Vol. I. c. 1487.

† Ch. of Pied. 153.

‡ “Contra novos hereticos, qui circumquaque jam fere per omnes ecclesias ebuliunt de puteo abyssi quasi jam princeps illorum incipiat dissolvi, et instet dies domini.”

§ Allix has omitted Evervinus’s declaration that this was done against his will. His words are, “rapti sunt a populis nimio zelo permotis, nobis tamen invitis: et in ignem positi, atque cremati.” Milner, who refers to Allix for the story, and who seems to have taken his extracts of the letter from Allix’s translation, with such verbal alterations as he saw fit to make, follows implicitly on this point. Vol. III. 378. His

[*Extract No. IV. from p. 365.*]

GULIELMUS NEUBRIGENSIS. A.D. 1197.

The account which this writer has given of the Publicans, who were condemned at the Council of Oxford, in 1160, has been already referred to, at p. 90 and 138. With the short statement of John Brompton (who appears merely to have abridged from William of Newbury) and a still shorter notice by Radulphus de Diceto, it forms, I believe, the only account which we have of the matter. I shall give all that I can find on the subject in these writers among the authorities; and here only translate what immediately refers to

following the "modern historian," and not the "original record," in this case was the less excusable, because he seems to have had access to it. He tells us, p. 331, "I use the Parisian edition of Mabillon." [As our present enquiry respects the "value" of Milner's History, it may be proper here to notice the "verbal alterations," to which I have alluded above. The reader will observe, that Milner gives the passage in inverted commas, and refers at the end of it to, "Allix, Churches of Piedmont, p. 140." It seems to me that under these circumstances he was not at liberty to make *any* alteration whatever; and I must add that, the mere discovery that any writer had done such a thing, would so destroy my confidence in him, as that I should consider his work, not merely of no value, but, as a mischievous and injurious thing, which ought to be exposed. Let him, if he will, quote laxly from memory, and tell us so—let him mistake, and blunder as much as he pleases—but deliberately to alter the language of a writer, whose words one professes to quote, (supposing one could be sure of always exactly preserving the idea) is something which I cannot reconcile with the fidelity which appears to me to be the most important qualification for a writer of history.

But if others are disposed to give greater licence in this respect, has Milner made a good use of it? Has he corrected Allix's translation? I have already said that he has not restored—I am very willing to believe he did not miss—the words in which the Prior declares that the heretics were burnt contrary to his will; but beside this, has he not softened down Allix's translation of the words in which Evervinus speaks of the proceedings of the people. Is "the people in excess of zeal," a better translation of "*populis nimio zelo permotis*" than "the people being incited by overmuch zeal." If there is no shade of difference

the point in question—namely, the *opinions* which are said to have been held by these alleged heretics. I must, however, remark upon the way in which they have been misrepresented by some modern historians. Henry, in his *History of England*, says—

“A company of about thirty men and women, who spoke the German language, appeared in England at this time, and soon attracted the attention of government by the singularity of their religious practices and opinions. It is indeed very difficult to discover with certainty what their opinions were, because they are recorded only by our monkish historians, who speak of them with much asperity. They were apprehended and brought before a Council of the Clergy at Oxford. Being interrogated about their religion, their teacher, named Gerard, a man of learning answered, in their name, that they were christians, and believed the doctrines of the apostles. Upon a more particular enquiry it was found, that they denied several of the received doctrines of the Church, as *purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the invocation of Saints*; and, refusing to abandon *those damnable heresies, as they were called*, they were condemned as incorrigible

between these expressions, why did Milner make any change—if this, had he a right to do it? Neither has he corrected that error of Allix, which makes it appear as if an indefinite number of heretics were burned on this occasion. He follows Allix in translating “socio sociis” by “his companions,”—and, when he alters in other cases, does he improve? Let the reader judge :

EVERVINUS.
Quorum quidam cum
satisfactione
Cum vidissent se non
posse procedere
Cum per triduum essent
admoniti et resplacere
noluerunt

ALLIX.
Whereof some with
satisfaction
When they saw they
could go no further
After that for three
days together they had
been admonished, and
found unwilling to re-
pent

MILNER.
Though several of them
have with satisfaction
Finding that they were
no impression
Having been admon-
ished to repent for three
days.

Is Milner's translation more correct and faithful? Such as it is, however, it has been adopted, professedly from his work, in the *Ecclesiastical History*, published by the Society for promoting useful Knowledge, p. 381. One or two verbal alterations are here also made, perhaps accidentally, but the omission is not supplied.]

heretics, and delivered to the secular arm to be punished. The King, at the instigation of the clergy, commanded them to be branded with a red hot iron on the forehead, to be whipped through the streets of Oxford, and having their clothes cut short by their girdles, to be turned out into the open fields, all persons being forbidden to afford them any shelter or relief under the severest penalties. This cruel sentence was executed in its utmost rigour; and it being the depth of winter, all these unhappy persons perished with cold and hunger." Book III. ch. II. §. 3.

Milner, who seems to have followed the "modern historian" implicitly, without troubling himself about the "original records," which were referred to, relates the story in much the same way;* and then adds—

"They had made one female convert in England, who, through fear of similar punishment, recanted. The whole number of the Germans remained, however, patient, serene, and composed, repeating, 'Blessed are those, who are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.' Their teacher Gerard, that he might be distinguished from the rest, had an additional stigma on his chin.

"What a darkness must at that time have filled this island! A wise and sagacious King, a renowned university, the whole body of the clergy and laity, all united *in expelling Christ from their coasts!* Brief as is the account of the Martyrs, it is *sufficiently evident that they were the martyrs of Christ.* Driven most probably from home by the rage of persecution, they had brought the *light and power of the Gospel* with them into England; and so totally senseless and corrupt was our nation, that none received it."

* Vol. III. p. 424. I have not the edition of Henry's History, to which Milner refers; but, in the fourth edition (8vo. 1805.) the authorities stand thus, "W. Neubrig. l. 2. c. 13. Item, p. 631. J. Brompt. col. 1050;" the latter reference being to the *column* of the *Decem Scriptores*, edited by Twysden. Milner's reference is, "Neubrig. Brompt. Collect. See Henry's Hist. of Eng. Vol. III. p. 240." For the particulars mentioned by him, which are not contained in Henry's History, I suppose that Milner was indebted to Mr. Berington.

"that the women who heard them were enraptured with the sound. He further says, that they taught men to live by the words of the gospel, and the apostles; that they led religious lives; that their manners were seasoned with grace, and their words prudent; that they freely discoursed of divine things that they might be esteemed good men. He observes that they taught their children and families the Epistles and Gospels." Vol. III. p. 453.*

* I don't carry the quotation farther in the text, because the above is all that relates to Reinerius, with whom we are at present concerned; but what must some of Milner's readers think of the continuation of the paragraph, "Claude, Bishop of Turin, wrote a treatise *against their doctrines*, in which he candidly owns that they themselves were blameless, without reproach among men, and that they observed the divine commands with all their might." Those who had read Milner's chapter in the same volume "On the opposition made to the corruptions of Popery in this century, particularly by Claudius, Bishop of Turin," would surely be surprised to find that among "the works of this great and good man" there was a treatise *against the doctrine* of the Waldenses. To be sure it would be something—and something more than has ever been done yet—to find that in the ninth century there were any Waldenses to write against; but that Claudius, Bishop of Turin, should have done it would be strange indeed. The simple fact, however, is that Milner has confounded a Bishop of the *ninth*, with an Archbishop of the *sixteenth* century; and does not appear to have been aware that he had already (and, as in the case of Reinerius, on the page immediately preceding) given this testimony of this same person, when he said "Seysillius says, it much strengthens the Waldenses, that, 'their heresy excepted, they generally live a purer life than other christians,' &c. This is what is principally to be complained of in Milner; that, after declaring that he *never* followed "modern historians," his work, *as to history*, is chiefly made up of extracts at second, or fiftieth, hand from modern historians, whose authorities, in many cases, he actually did not understand, because he did not sufficiently consult original writers. Why did he not know that *Rogerus* was *Hoveden*—and *Reinerius*, the *pontifical Inquisitor*—and that *Seysillius*, was *Claude*, Archbishop of Turin?—Why did he write such unintelligible matter by way of reference as "Neubrig. Brompt. Collect."—why did he palm off upon the poor Abbot of Croyland (who knew even less of the matter than he did himself) the story about a Bishop of

ful, let the reader of Milner's History judge. In the present case, all that he supposed himself to know of these people was, that they denied the doctrines of purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the invocation of the saints, and that they were "patient, serene, and composed," (which latter is, as far as I know, an addition of his own) and on this he built his judgment.

But what evidence have we, that these persons said anything about *purgatory*, or *prayers for the dead*, or the *invocation of Saints*?* If, indeed, they were Publicans,

against Jovinian, because, from carelessly reading the translation, he was led to suppose that Mosheim had spoken too well of him. "I admire," he says, "the *positiveness* of Mosheim, in deciding so *peremptorily* for the character of a man, of whose writings nothing has come down to us, but a single sentence so barbarous and doubtful." Now, what had Mosheim so positively, and peremptorily, said? I really think that a reader of Milner would be more likely to form a favourable opinion of Jovinian, than a reader of Mosheim. The former writer, indeed, states the matter as doubtful, but finds "that which strongly inclines him to hope" that the real character of Jovinian was good; the latter is so far from positively, and peremptorily, deciding in his favour, that he expresses suspicion, but gives no opinion at all; and Milner should have known, before he "censured" Mosheim, that the "*worthy opposer*," and the "*judicious opinions*," and "*judicious reasonings*," of Jovinian, were merely flourishes of the translator, who was wont thus to embellish his author, though sometimes at the expence of fidelity and truth. Mosheim, speaking of Aerius, says, "*Videtur vir hic religionem ad priscam simplicitatem revocare voluisse: quod consilium in se spectatum pulchrum est, tametsi in causis et agendi ratione forte quædam reprehendi possint. Plures hujus generis homines hac ætate erant, qui progressum superstitionum et errorum de vera religionis natura moleste ferentes, ei sese objiciebant, sed laboris hunc unum fructum capiebant, ut infamia notarentur. Emi- net inter eos Jovinianus, monachus Italus.*" *Sæc. IV. P. II. Cap. iii. §. 22. p. 173.*

* The only colour (it is no authority) for Henry's statement, is a note of Picard's, in Hearne's edition of William of Newbury, which Henry refers to by "Item, p. 631." Picard quotes a MS. of Ralph of Coggeshall, in which he speaks of the persecution of the Publicans generally; and, among others, of these. He afterwards (but with no special reference to them) details the doctrines of the Sect. His state-

"Hear what a character an ancient Inquisitor gives of this people," and then, without seeming at all aware that this "ancient inquisitor" is the person to whom he had already thrice referred, and who had been actually named in the preceding sentence, he gives, what (if it cannot be called another version of the passage which he had given before) is, I believe, something more like a real translation of certain words of Reinerius from which a part of the preceding quotation had been, in someway or other, extracted. He now professes to quote from "Allix, p. 235;" he gives the passage with marks of quotation; and he does not intimate that a single word is altered, or omitted. The following columns contain the original of Reinerius, and the translation of Allix, as given by himself, and by Milner:—

REINERIUS SACCHO,

c. vii.

*Hæretici cognoscuntur
per mores et verba; sunt
enim in moribus compo-
siti et modesti:*

*superbiam in vestibus
non habent, quia nec
preciosis nec multum
abjectis utuntur.*

*Negotiationes non ha-
bent propter mendacia
et juramenta et fraudes
vitandas; sed tantum vi-
vunt de labore ut opifices.*

*Doctores etiam
ipsorum sunt sutores et
textores.*

*Divitias non multipli-
cant, sed necessariis sunt
contenti.*

ALLIX'S TRANSLA-
TION, as it stands in the
'Churches of Piedmont,'
p. 235. (or Oxf. Ed. 257.)

Heretics are known by
their manners and words;
for they are orderly and
modest in their manners
and behaviour;

they avoid all pride in
their habits, as wearing
neither very rich clothes,
nor over mean and ragged
ones.

They keep up no com-
merce or trade, to avoid
lies, swearing, and deceit,
but only live by the la-
bour of their own hands,
as handicraftsmen and
day-labourers;

and their teachers
are weavers and tailors.

They do not heap up
riches, but are content
with necessities.

ALLIX'S TRANSLA-
TION, as given by
MILNER, Vol. III. 472.

The Heretics are
known by their manners
and words; for they are
orderly and modest in
their manners and beha-
viour.

They avoid all appear-
ance of pride in their
dress, they neither wear
rich clothes, nor are they
too mean and ragged in
their attire.

They avoid commerce
that they may be free
from falsehood and de-
ceit: they live by manual
industry, as day-labour-
ers or mechanics;

and their preach-
ers are weavers and tai-
lors.

They seek not to amass
wealth, but are content
with the necessities of
life.

*Additional Remarks on the subject of the foregoing
Extracts.*

THESE extracts contain nearly every reference to Milner's Church History which occurs in my book on the Albigenses and Waldenses;* and most of them relate, more or less directly, to that subject. That they do not, however, expose all the error, confusion, and false view of things, which we find in that one part of Milner's History, will appear from the following statement.

Everybody, who has read about the Waldenses, must have seen quotations from *Reinerius Saccho*. He has been constantly, and triumphantly, brought forward, by one writer after another, as a popish inquisitor (and therefore an enemy), and an apostate Waldensian (and therefore well informed), to testify as to the antiquity and piety of the Waldenses. Whether the author of the books† which go under the name of Reinerius was really the Italian Inquisitor, I very much doubt; but this is no place to discuss the question—that he had *not* been a Waldensian before he became a Monk, is plain from his own words. If, indeed, there is anything in his book which is perfectly clear, it is that he had been one of the *Cathari*; a sect who, as I have elsewhere shewn, were not only distinct from, but opposed to, the Waldenses, or as Reinerius called

* I am not aware that the name of Milner occurs anywhere else except at p. 93, 123, 130, 389, where the reference is not sufficiently important to warrant the long explanation which would be necessary to make it intelligible.

† Or perhaps I should rather say "the book," for the *Summa Fratris Renarii* is in fact little more than an extract from the *Liber contra Waldenses*, if indeed it is not, as I suspect, the original work, while the larger book is a compilation. As far as relates to the present question, however, they are identical.

Thoulouse.* Had Milner got any other "original records," whereby to refute the "modern historian," except the "Waldensian records?" and would not they, in his estimation, convict these persons of most grievous falsehood, in professing their belief of the popish doctrine of transubstantiation? Had he any "original records" of the persecutions in which such numbers were "continually suffering" for a faith which (unless they belied it) was considered "sufficiently laudable, and catholic," by their enemies? If he had, I wish he had referred to them.

But Mr. Berington "believes these same enemies, who gave no proof of their sincerity that we know of." I really do not know what Milner means, by their "sincerity." Does he mean to doubt, that they were sincere, in their belief of the popish principles, which they professed? or that they could be suspected of any insincerity at all analogous to that which has been (whether justly or not) charged on these Albigenes? I think that could not be his meaning. Does he mean then, that, being persons of whose love of truth we have no proof, we ought not to believe what they say? This, to be sure, is going a good way, and looks a little like prejudice; but suppose that, for sake of argument, we grant it; what would he have us *disbelieve*? Did he think their letters a mere romance, and that they never went to Thoulouse at all? No—he believes "the account of the barbarous treatment of the rich old gentleman of Thoulouse," which "confirms the truth of Perrin's narrative of the like persecutions, and demonstrates, from the testimony even of Roman writers, that the horrors of papal tyranny, have not been misrepresented in general, by protestant authors"—Well, then, so far, we are to believe—and, I repeat, what does he want us to disbelieve? Is it the fact, that these persons made any confession at all, or that they made *such* a confession as their enemies record, or that, having made such a con-

* "Principabantur in populo, dominabantur in clero."

fession, they were dealt with as their enemies represent? Does he mean that these Albigenses made a truly protestant confession, "testifying against the demonolatrous apostacy," and that their false enemies, instead of ordering them off to the stake, told them it was sufficiently laudable, and catholic, and contented themselves with excommunicating them, because they would not swear?

Or, by "their enemies," does he mean the Count of Thoulouse, and the others, who confronted them? They "gave no proof of sincerity, *that we know of*"—Well, but on the other hand, do "we know of" any reason why they should bring such charges against innocent persons, who *really held* such purely popish opinions as these persons professed? Why should they persecute people who were as good papists as themselves?

In short, if we believe their enemies, they were Manicheans—if we believe themselves, they were Papists—which are we to believe? perhaps, as we are not called upon immediately to decide, it may be as well to suspend our belief of either party, until we have made some farther progress in our enquiry.

[*Extract No. III. from p. 343.*]

About the year 1147, Saint Bernard received a letter from Evervinus, Præpositus of Steinfield, near Cologne, respecting some heretics who had been recently discovered, and burned, in that city. He give them no name, except that he says they called themselves apostles; and Bernard seems to imply that they did not assume, and were not known by, any particular appellation.* This abbot directed

* Quære ab illis suæ sectæ auctorem; neminem dabunt. quo nomine istos titulove censebis? nullo. *Serm. in Cant.* LXVI. Vol. I. 1494. He says, indeed, in the same discourse, "se. . . apostolicos nominant;" but it does not seem clear that they took this title. At all events they were distinct from the sect of the Apostolics.

two sermons against the errors of these heretics, which seem to have been evidently suggested by the letter of Evervinus; though, from some expressions, I am led to think that he was not indebted to that letter exclusively for his knowledge of the sect.

The letter has been printed by Mabillon,* and as it may throw light on our present subject, I shall give that part which has been translated by Allix,† in his words. He omits the introduction, and I see nothing in it worth noticing for our purpose, except that Evervinus calls upon Bernard to come forward against “the *new* heretics.”‡

“There have been lately some heretics discovered amongst us, near Cologne, whereof some with satisfaction returned again to the Church: two of these, viz. one that was a Bishop amongst them, and his companions, openly opposed us in the assembly of the clergy and laity, the Lord Archbishop himself being present, with many of the nobility, maintaining their heresy from the words of Christ and the Apostles. But when they saw they could go no further, they desired that a day might be appointed for them, upon which thy might bring along with them men skilful in their belief, promising to return to the church, provided they should find their masters defective in answering what was opposed to them; but that otherwise they would rather die than depart from their judgment. Upon this their declaration, after that for three days together they had been admonished, and found unwilling to repent, they were seized by the people, being incited by overmuch zeal, and put into the fire and burnt; and” &c. §

* Op. Bern. Vol. I. c. 1487.

† Ch. of Pied. 153.

‡ “Contra novos hereticos, qui circumquaque jam fere per omnes “ecclesias ebulliunt de puteo abyssi quasi jam principes illorum incipiat “dissolvi, et instet dies domini.”

§ Allix has omitted Evervinus’s declaration that this was done against his will. His words are, “rapti sunt a populis nimio zelo permotis, nobis tamen invitis: et in ignem positi, atque cremati.” Milner, who refers to Allix for the story, and who seems to have taken his extracts of the letter from Allix’s translation, with such verbal alterations as he saw fit to make, follows implicitly on this point. Vol. III. 378. His

[*Extract No. IV. from p. 365.*]

GULIELMUS NEUBRIGENSIS. A.D. 1197.

The account which this writer has given of the Publicans, who were condemned at the Council of Oxford, in 1160, has been already referred to, at p. 90 and 138. With the short statement of John Brompton (who appears merely to have abridged from William of Newbury) and a still shorter notice by Radulphus de Diceto, it forms, I believe, the only account which we have of the matter. I shall give all that I can find on the subject in these writers among the authorities; and here only translate what immediately refers to

following the "modern historian," and not the "original record," in this case was the less excusable, because he seems to have had access to it. He tells us, p. 331, "I use the Parisian edition of Mabillon." [As our present enquiry respects the "value" of Milner's History, it may be proper here to notice the "verbal alterations," to which I have alluded above. The reader will observe, that Milner gives the passage in inverted commas, and refers at the end of it to, "Allix, Churches of Piedmont, p. 140." It seems to me that under these circumstances he was not at liberty to make *any* alteration whatever; and I must add that, the mere discovery that any writer had done such a thing, would so destroy my confidence in him, as that I should consider his work, not merely of no value, but, as a mischievous and injurious thing, which ought to be exposed. Let him, if he will, quote laxly from memory, and tell us so—let him mistake, and blunder as much as he pleases—but deliberately to alter the language of a writer, whose words one professes to quote, (supposing one could be sure of always exactly preserving the idea) is something which I cannot reconcile with the fidelity which appears to me to be the most important qualification for a writer of history.

But if others are disposed to give greater licence in this respect, has Milner made a good use of it? Has he corrected Allix's translation? I have already said that he has not restored—I am very willing to believe he did not miss—the words in which the Prior declares that the heretics were burnt contrary to his will; but beside this, has he not softened down Allix's translation of the words in which Evervinus speaks of the proceedings of the people. Is "the people in excess of zeal," a better translation of "*populis nimio zelo permotis*" than "the people being incited by overmuch zeal." If there is no shade of difference

the point in question—namely, the *opinions* which are said to have been held by these alleged heretics. I must first, however, remark upon the way in which they have been misrepresented by some modern historians. Henry, in his History of England, says—

“A company of about thirty men and women, who spoke the German language, appeared in England at this time, and soon attracted the attention of government by the singularity of their religious practices and opinions. It is indeed very difficult to discover with certainty what their opinions were, because they are recorded only by our monkish historians, who speak of them with much asperity. They were apprehended and brought before a Council of the Clergy at Oxford. Being interrogated about their religion, their teacher, named Gerard, a man of learning, answered, in their name, that they were christians, and believed the doctrines of the apostles. Upon a more particular enquiry, *it was found*, that they denied several of the received doctrines of the Church, as *purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the invocation of Saints*; and, refusing to abandon *those damnable heresies, as they were called*, they were condemned as incorrigible

between these expressions, why did Milner make any change—if there is, had he a right to do it? Neither has he corrected that error of Allix, which makes it appear as if an indefinite number of heretics were burned on this occasion. He follows Allix in translating “*socio suo*,” by “his companions,”—and, when he alters in other cases, does he improve? Let the reader judge :

EVERVINUS.	ALLIX.	MILNER.
Quorum quidam cum satisfactione	Whereof some with satisfaction	Though several of them have with satisfaction
Cum vidiissent se non posse procedere	When they saw they could go no further	Finding that they made no impression
Cum per triduum essent admoniti et respiscere noluissent	After that for three days together they had been admonished, and found unwilling to repent	Having been admonished to repent for three days.

Is Milner's translation more correct and faithful? Such as it is, however, it has been adopted, professedly from his work, in the Ecclesiastical History, published by the Society for promoting useful Knowledge, p. 351. One or two verbal alterations are here also made, perhaps accidentally, but the omission is not supplied.]

heretics, and delivered to the secular arm to be punished. The King, at the instigation of the clergy, commanded them to be branded with a red hot iron on the forehead, to be whipped through the streets of Oxford, and having their clothes cut short by their girdles, to be turned out into the open fields, all persons being forbidden to afford them any shelter or relief under the severest penalties. This cruel sentence was executed in its utmost rigour; and it being the depth of winter, all these unhappy persons perished with cold and hunger." Book III. ch. II. §. 3.

Milner, who seems to have followed the "modern historian" implicitly, without troubling himself about the "original records," which were referred to, relates the story in much the same way;* and then adds—

"They had made one female convert in England, who, through fear of similar punishment, recanted. The whole number of the Germans remained, however, patient, serene, and composed, repeating, 'Blessed are those, who are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.' Their teacher Gerard, that he might be distinguished from the rest, had an additional stigma on his chin.

"What a darkness must at that time have filled this island! A wise and sagacious King, a renowned university, the whole body of the clergy and laity, all united *in expelling Christ from their coasts!* Brief as is the account of the Martyrs, it is *sufficiently evident that they were the martyrs of Christ.* Driven most probably from home by the rage of persecution, they had brought the *light and power of the Gospel* with them into England; and so totally senseless and corrupt was our nation, that none received it."

* Vol. III. p. 424. I have not the edition of Henry's History, to which Milner refers; but, in the fourth edition (8vo. 1805.) the authorities stand thus, "W. Neubrig. l. 2. c. 13. Item, p. 631. J. Brompt. col. 1050;" the latter reference being to the *column* of the *Decem Scriptores*, edited by Twysden. Milner's reference is, "Neubrig. Brompt. Collect. See Henry's Hist. of Eng. Vol. III. p. 240." For the particulars mentioned by him, which are not contained in Henry's History, I suppose that Milner was indebted to Mr. Berington.

to justify his omitting it.* I shall not, however, shrink from saying what I think of the matter, which is simply this—that Milner did see it—that he knew very little about the heretics, or the inquisitors, of the thirteenth century; but had a general, and though rather a vague, yet a very strong, idea that the one was a very good and the other a very bad set of people—that this charge was a bit of prejudice, or malice, or mistake on the part of the Inquisitor which he not only might quietly omit, but which it was on the whole best and most expedient to say nothing about.

If we now proceed to page 202 of the fourth volume, we shall again, and for the fifth time, fall in with our old friend Reinerius, though his name is somewhat changed, and his occupation such as we should not expect. Of his identity there can be no doubt—for though Milner does not appear to have been aware of it, and calls him “Sancho Reinher,” yet he tells us that he “was an apostate and a persecutor of the Waldenses in the *thirteenth* century.” And for what purpose therefore does the reader suppose that he is cited? Why, of all things in the world, to bear testimony to the good character of the disciples of a man who was not born until near a century after Reinerius is supposed to have written his book. His testimony, first garbled and

* This “*parum orant*” has been much in the way of the admirers of the Waldenses; but I do not know that any one has used so violent a method as Milner, who omits it, and goes on, in a quotation. Mr. Sharon Turner, in his *History of England*, snaps the quotation short off after “learning or teaching,” though in the middle of a sentence. Vol. V. p. 129. Mr. Vaughan, in his *Life of Wycliffe*, (and I must observe that both these gentlemen refer by the column to the original in the ‘*Bibliotheca Patrum*’) does the same; and the words with which he closes the quotation, and continues the paragraph, are worth copying;—“ever employed in labour, in reading, or in communicating knowledge [here a full stop, and reference to Reinerius]. If piety is to be at all determined by its fruits, these statements from a contemporary and an opponent must be decisive of its reality in the case of the Waldenses.” Vol I. p. 141.

wrested in favour of the *Leonists*, was so much to the purpose, that it is repeated in behalf of the *WICKLIFFITES*. Notwithstanding that Milner does, as I have said, on that very page, tell us that this Sancho Reinher was a persecutor of the Waldenses in the thirteenth century, he gives us another, and a very curious, translation of the passage which he had given before from Allix. Then Milner made it say "*the heretics*," which Reinerius and Allix did not; and now it is for "*the Wickliffites*," of whom Reinerius could not have heard. The reader will perceive that the passage is evidently the same, though the order of some of the sentences is altered, and it is a very "free translation"—indeed so much so that I really believe Milner did not know that he had seen it before:—

"Hæretici cognoscuntur per mores et verba; sunt enim in moribus compositi et modesti: superbiam in vestibus non habent: quia nec preciosis nec multum abjectis utuntur.

tantum vivunt de labore ut opifices.....divitias non multiplicant, sed necessariis sunt contenti.

Negotiationes non habent propter mendacia et juramenta et fraudes vitandas.

Casti etiam sunt.....temperati etiam sunt.....ad tabernas non eunt, nec ad choreas, nec ad alias vanitates.....semper operantur discunt, vel docent

et ideo parum orant.

Cavent etiam...a juramento."

"The disciples of WICKLIFFE are men of a serious, modest deportment; avoiding all ostentation in dress, mixing little with the busy world, and complaining of the debauchery of mankind. They maintain themselves wholly by their own labour, and utterly despise wealth; being fully content with bare necessities. They follow no traffic, because it is attended with so much lying, swearing, and cheating. They are chaste and temperate; are never seen in taverns, or amused by the trifling gayeties of life. You find them always employed; either learning or teaching. They are concise and devout in their prayers; blaming an unanimated proximity. They never swear," &c.

Some other passages, taken from various parts of Reinerius, are added to this new edition of the extract. Of them it is not necessary here to speak; but what are we to say of what I have copied? Not to mention the extreme absurdity of applying it to the Wickliffites, (a mistake of which I may, perhaps, on some future occasion give the history) what shall we say to the shameless perversion of the author's meaning? Does anybody—or could anybody ever—think that by “*parum orant*” Reinerius meant anything like the paraphrase which is here given? The obnoxious words, which were before omitted, are here amplified and twisted into something lovely, and of good report, with a degree of assurance which is quite astonishing.* I no more believe that Milner did it, than I believe that he had ever read the work of Reinerius, or nine tenths of the books which his undertaking required that he should consult. He however has set it afloat, and it is upon the

* If the Albigenses and Waldenses have suffered from the perverse ingenuity of their popish adversaries, who sometimes wrested their words to bring out the worst meaning which they could possibly bear, it has been in a great measure made up to them by their admirers, who have shewn at least as much skill and boldness in putting the best construction on whatever they said or did. A curious specimen of this I find in Mr. Blair's History of the Waldenses, which I had not seen until this pamphlet was in the press, and in which I have as yet read little but what relates to Reinerius Saccho. This writer had mentioned, as one of the causes of heresy, that the heretics had translated the scriptures into the vulgar tongue; and he adds “*Et quia sunt laici iidotæ, false et corrupte scripturam exponunt, ut est illud Joan. I. ‘In propria venit et sui eum non receperunt.’ Ibi dicunt sui id est porci, dicentes sui pro suis. Et illud Psalmi ‘Increpa feras harundinis,’ straffe die thier der Schwalben, dicentes, hirundinis pro harundinis,*” &c. As far as I know, Mr. Blair is the first person who ever supposed that Reinerius meant anything but to expose the ignorance of laymen, who had misconstrued the text of Scripture in sheer ignorance. Mr. Blair's version of the matter, however, is as follows: “He is enraged” [I know not what sign of rage is exhibited by Reinerius] “at some of their expositions, such

authority of his work that it has been widely circulated as a noble testimony to the LOLLARDS.* In excuse for those who adopted it, it must be added that Milner, not merely inserts the word "Wickliffites" in the quotation, but he goes on to say "these excellencies in the character of the *followers of Wickliff*, are not here mentioned by the author, &c. So little in the *times of Wickliff* and his *followers* had the prevailing religion, &c."

"as that on the words, 'he came to his own, and his own, *sui*, received him not.' Reinerius *says*, the Waldenses by a *pun* on *sui*, *his own*, turn it to *sues*, swine, and apply it to Christ's enemies. He *thinks*, they mean the Catholics, as if they were no better than swine.'" Vol. I. p. 404. Where Mr. Blair found Reinerius saying, or thinking, anything about the matter, except the few words which I have quoted, I do not know; and how he can bring out of them any such meaning, I cannot imagine.

* In Milner's History this passage stands under the head-line "Persecution of the Lollards." Mr. Fry, in his short History of the Church of Christ, has copied it exactly; and introduces it by saying, "Mr. Milner towards the close of his account of the Lollards, has given their character from a popish writer, which speaks more powerfully in their favour than any panegyric of friends could do." p. 257. It is even transferred (but without acknowledgment) into the Tract of the London Tract Society, entitled "The Lollards," Part I. p. 6. where it is thus introduced, "The following description of the *Lollards* is given by a Romish Inquisitor of those times, named Reinher. Strange to say he thought such conduct highly deserving of censure, 'The disciples of Wickliffe,'"—and so on verbatim, as in Milner. Since the foregoing part of this note was written and printed, I have found that this extract is repeated in a more recent publication of the Tract Society, entitled "Lives of the British Reformers from Wickliff to Fox;" and, as the version is again improved (by whom, or on whose authority, I know not) it may be worth while to copy it, marking the variations by *italics*. "There was another class whose attachment to the doctrines of the Reformer was of a more spiritual nature; who felt the evil of sin, and desired to live holy unto God: these were far less numerous. They are described by Reinher, an inquisitor of those times. He says, 'The disciples of Wickliff are men of a serious, modest deportment; they avoid all ostentation in dress, mix little with the busy world, and complain of the debauchery of mankind. They maintain themselves

—

